Encyclopaedia of Indian War of Independence

Vol. 19

Contents

1

C. Rajgopalachari

Chakravarthi Rajagopalachari (December 10, 1878 - December 25, 1972), known as or Rajaji or C.R., was an Indian lawyer, writer, statesman and a devout Hindu . He was the second Governor-General of independent India. Later he became the Chief Minister of Madras State, and was one of the first recipients of India's highest civilian award Bharat Ratna (in 1954), the other two being Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan and Dr. C.V.Raman, all from the same state Tamil Nadu.

EARLY LIFE

Rajagopalachari was born into a Tamil Brahmin[Sri Vaishnava] family in a small village called Thorapalli of the then Salem District. (Now Thorapalli is in Krishnagiri District.) He had his school education at Hosur and college education at Madras (Chennai) and Bangalore. He was married to Alamelu Mangamma when he was young and they had five children. His wife died when he was 37 and he solely took the responsibility of taking care of his children. Rajaji studied law in Bangalore and started his practice at Salem. As a lawyer he was very successful. When in Salem, Rajaji showed keen interest in the social and political affairs. He was even elected as the Municipal Chairman of Salem and he held that post for two years. He was affectionately hailed as the "Mango of Salem".

WITH THE CONGRESS

Rajaji started to take part in the politics of the nation at the beginning of the 1900s. At first he was drawn towards Bal

Gangadhar Tilak. He had a good relationship with V. O. Chidambaram Pillai, an ardent follower of Tilak. During the Home Rule League days he admired Dr. Annie Besant and he highly revered Salem C. Vijayaraghavachariar, one of the founders of the Congress Party.

In the year 1919 Rajaji chose to follow Mahatma Gandhi, who had just returned from South Africa. In the year 1921, Rajaji was selected as the General Secretary of the Congress Party and he came into close contact with Jawaharlal Nehru, Vallabhbhai Patel, Maulana Azad,Anugrah Narayan Sinha, Rajendra Prasad etc. and began to gain stature in the party.

At one time considered Mahatma Gandhi's heir,[1] this brilliant lawyer from Salem, Tamil Nadu was regarded in pre-independence years as one of the top leaders of the Congress along with Jawaharlal Nehru, Rajendra Prasad, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. Rajaji was also connected by marriage to Mahatma Gandhi, as his daughter married the Mahatma's third son, Devdas Gandhi. Of the five, Rajaji, Nehru and Patel were christened the "head, heart and hands" of Gandhi, in whose shadows they remained till his death. Ironically, all three of them were to have a tempestuous relationship, bound together only by their common goal and Gandhi's charm. However, they respected each other immensely. Nehru wrote about Rajaji in his autobiography of how Rajaji's "brilliant intellect, selfless character, and penetrating powers of analysis have been a tremendous asset to our cause". Rajaji's intellect and political acumen is often compared with that of Chanakya.

He had a very intimate relationship with Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Patel. In fact after his resignation as Governor-General he was called back to join Nehru's Cabinet mainly to work as a bridge between Nehru and Patel, a role in which he very well suited and succeeded after Mahatma Gandhi. Though in later years Rajaji developed differences with Nehru with regards to economic policy, their personal relationship remained unstrained. Both had a high regard and affection on each other. Sardar Patel had always identified Rajaji as one of his close companions, he always shared a cordial relationship with Rajaji. He was so open to Rajaji that he shared his personal views

about Nehru, Maulana Azad and their policy with him. Both of Sardar Patel and Rajaji were averse to socialism and communism.

As one of the Top Five Leaders of the Congress, Rajaji had to play a very vital role in policy making of the Congress Party. He was a member in the Working Committee from 1919 to 1942 and then 1950 to 1955. He also had a cordial relationship with E.V.Ramasamy Naicker also known as Periyar, who was the founder of the dravidian centric party Dravidar Kazhagam. Though they had vast difference of opinions, Periyar leaning towards socialism and Rajaji being a follower of classical liberalism, they remained good friends till Periyar's death. Though he was active in Congress for nearly 50 years, Rajaji was not Congress president even once. In 1932 he was the acting President of Congress Party and played a vital role in forging the Poona Pact with Ambedkar. Rajaji was requested to occupy the Presidency of Congress in the years 1934 and 1936 by Mahatma Gandhi and Sardar Patel but he refused. Once again in 1950 Rajaji was sought after by Nehru and Patel to accept the Presidency of the party but he put down the offer once again.

Rajaji was perhaps the earliest Congress leader in the 1940s to accept the right of Muslims to self-determination. He devised a formula whereby there could be common defence and communications between the two nations. But the Rajaji formula was rejected by Jinnah as well as some Congress leaders. Rajaji was known to be a fierce defender of his political ideals, and did not hesitate to contradict his closest aides and friends in public, whenever he sensed a threat to them.

In the words of Jawaharlal Nehru, "Rajaji represents fundamentally the highest type of mind in India." A close associate of Mahatma Gandhi, "conscience keeper of the Mahatma", he was an ardent freedom fighter.

After serving time in British prisons for his work in the independence movement, he became a member of the Governor's Council in 1946 and first held the portfolios of Education and Arts and in Jan,1947 held the portfolio of Industries and Supply and after the resignation of Liaquat Ali Khan from the Interim Government, the portfolio of Finance was also held by him. In 1948, after Indian independence was attained, he replaced

Mountbatten to become the only Indian Governor-General of India, in which post he continued until the Republic was declared on January 26, 1950. The office was replaced by that of President, first held by Rajendra Prasad.

Rajaji became a member of Jawaharlal Nehru's cabinet, first without portfolio, then, after Patel's death, as Home Minister. He was chief minister of Madras from 1952 to 1954.

On leaving government, he was among the first recipients of the Bharat Ratna, the Indian government's highest civilian award.

AS GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Rajaji has the unique distinction of being the only Indian Governor-General. Prior to his occupying this distinguished position he had been serving as the Governor of West Bengal. Rajaji had served as Acting Governor-General during November,1947, when Lord Mountbatten was in England to attend Prince Phillip's marriage to then-Princess Elizabeth. Rajaji led a very simple life in the viceregal palace.

It is known that he used to wash his own clothes. During this time a friend of Rajaji came to visit him. He was surprised to see the acting Governor-General Rajaji polishing his own shoes and asked why a governal general should polish his shoes. Rajaji replied sarcastically "Yes, indeed it is my own shoe and who's shoe do you polish?". Rajaji as Governor-General, Jawaharlal Nehru, as Prime Minister and Sardar Patel, as Deputy Prime Minister, constituted an impressive triumvirate which ruled the country from 1948 - 1950.

PRESIDENT OF INDIA

By the end of the year 1949, it was assumed that Rajaji, already Governor-General, was going to continue as President. But due to the internal politics of the Congress mainly between the supporters of Nehru and Patel, Rajendra Prasad was also taken up as a possible candidate. Congressmen who were opponents of Rajaji used his non-participation in the Quit India Movement as a weapon against him. Rajaji immediately called Rajendra Prasad and told him that as he did not want the country to witness a conflict between senior leaders so soon after the death of Mahatma

Gandhi, he would withdraw from the Presidential Contest. Thus Rajendra Prasad became the President.

AS UNION HOME MINISTER

Rajaji served as the country's Home Minister for nearly 10 months. He at that time warned Nehru about the expansionist designs of China and also expressed regret over the Tibet problem, his views being in par with that of Sardar Patel, his predecessor. He had also expressed concern over the demands made about establishing new states on a linguistic basis, saying that it would generate differences amongst the people. Once in a cabinet meeting regarding Foreign Policy, Rajaji made a point and Nehru's view was different from that of Rajaji. The other members in the meeting also supported Nehru. Nehru turned to Rajaji and said "See Rajaji, the majority is with me!". To this Rajaji retorted "Yes, Jawaharlal! The majority is with you, but the logic is with me!". Nehru laughed and supported Rajaji's proposal.

When Rajaji was piloting the Press Bill in the Parliament in the year 1951, Shyama Prasad Mukerjee interrupted and said "Rajaji! Please remember that you have ceased to be a lawyer". Rajaji shot back: "Yes indeed, I accept that I have ceased to be a lawyer. But I have not ceased to be reasonable!".

As Chief Minister of Madras Presidency/Madras State (Tamil Nadu)

Rajaji became the Premier of Madras Presidency in 1937 and he made Hindi a compulsory language in schools. This was immediately opposed and protests were organised by Periyar Ramasami and Sir A. D. Panneerselvam a few people were killed in the Anti-Hindi agitations. He introduced prohibition in 1937 and to compensate the loss of revenue introduced sales tax for the first time in India. He resigned along with other Congress governments in 1939 due to viceroy of India, Lord Linlithgow declaring that India was also at war without consultation and no discussion on the question of immediate independence.

C.Rajagopalachari who had become the Chief Minister of Madras State for the second time between 1952 and 1954, had introduced the scheme of conducting classes in the schools in the forenoon and asking the students to learn the traditional jobs of

their parents in the afternoon. At the first stage it was implement in the rural areas of the state. The Dravidian leaders assessed that the scheme was a clever device to keep the Shudra and Panchama castes as illiterates or semi-literates. Their children had just begun to attend school after centuries of denial of educational opportunities. They dubbed C. Rajagopalachari's scheme as Castiest Education Plan (Kula Kalvi Thittam) and began to agitate under Periyar's leadership demanding its withdrawal. As a consequence, the Chief Minister had to resign in March 1954, and Kamaraj assumed office on 14th April. Kamaraj abolished the half-day-teaching scheme, and assured Periyar that his Government would extent educational facilities to people in every nook and corner of the state.

Rajaji became the Chief minister due to a constitutional impropriety in 1952.In the 1952 elections Congress Party was reduced to a minority in the State Assembly and the Communist Party of India led coalition appeared to be in a better position to form the Government. But Governor Sri Prakasa nominated Rajaji to the Legislative Council without the advice of the council of ministers and the selection of a nominated member as Chief Minister and further majority was obtained by luring opposition MLA to join the party and Nehru was furious and wrote to Rajaji that" the one thing we must avoid giving is the impression that we stick to office and we want to keep others out at all costs" Rajaji refused to contest a bye election and remained a non elected member.

Dr. P.C. Alexander himself a former Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra governor writes that the most conspicuous case of constitutional impropriety was the one by Sri Prakasa when he invited Rajagopalachari to form the government in the Madras state. During this time Potti Sriramulu called for a separate state by the name of Andhra and went on an unconditional fast until his goal was achieved. He died following complications that arouse during the fast and violent riots broke out in the Telugu areas of Madras State. Jawaharlal Nehru had initially warned that this method of fasting to achieve administrative or political changes will put end to democratic government but after death of Potti Sriramulu Nehru agreed to the demand for separate state of Andhra

but refused to include Madras (now Chennai) city in Andhra. Serious allegations arouse that Rajaji did not intervene to break the fast or provide medical help for Sriramulu even though the fast had continued for over 50 days.

On a side note, only one other person,Jatin Das, before Sriramulu, in modern Indian history actually fasted to death. In most cases they either gave up, hospitalised or arrested and force fed. The State of Andhra was carved out of the Madras State in 1953, Rajaji remained aloof from the Andhra State and related issues. He removed controls on foodgrains and introduced a new education policy based on family vocation. According to this policy students had to goto school in the morning and to compulsorily learn the family vocation, like carpentry, masonry etc after school. It was severely opposed as casteist and dubbed Kula Kalvi Thittam (Hereditary Education Policy) by his close friend Periyar who vehemently opposed it. This policy was under attack this from within the Congress as well as outside it. This ultimately led to his resignation in 1954.

SPLIT

Just ahead of the 1957, CR and his followers broke away from the Congress and formed the Congress Reform Committee. He came to an understanding with his former adversary, Forward Bloc leader U. Muthuramalingam Thevar, in forming an anti-Congress front. The two parties contested the elections jointly. In September CRC was renamed the Indian National Democratic Congress.

THE SWATANTRA PARTY

In July 1957, CR merged his INDC into the Swatantra Party. He attacked the license-permit Raj fearing its potential for corruption and stagnation, even while the tide was in favour of Nehru's socialistic pattern. He wrote in his newspaper Swarajya thus -

"Encouraging competition in industry and giving incentives for higher production are good for the public as well as for the private interests. I want an India where talent and energy can find scope for play without having to cringe and obtain special

individual permission from officials and ministers, and where their efforts will be judged by the open market in India and abroad. [...] I want the inefficiency of public management to go where the competitive economy of private management can look after affairs. [...] I want the corruptions of the permit-license-raj to go. [...] I want the officials appointed to administer laws and policies to be free from pressures of the bosses of the ruling party, and gradually restored back to the standards of fearless honesty which they once maintained. [...] I want real equal opportunities for all and no private monopolies created by the permit-license-raj. [...] I want the money power of big business to be isolated from politics. [...] I want an India where dharma once again rules the hearts of men and not greed."

There were many great personalities who got themselves affiliated with the Swatantra Party such as K.M. Munshi, Prof. N.G. Ranga, Minoo Masani, H.M. Patel, V.P. Menon and Gayatri Devi of Jaipur. The party proved to be a good opponent to the ruling Congress. The party won 45 Lok Sabha members in the 1967 general elections and was the single largest party in the opposition. It was the principal opposition party in the states of Rajasthan and Gujarat. It also formed a coalition government in Orissa. It also had a significance presence in the Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Bihar. In the mid 1960s it won nearly 207 legislative assembly seats all over India, as against 153 by the communists, 149 by the socialists and 115 by the Jan Sangh. But the Party started to disintegrate after the death of Rajaji. It finally merged with Charan Singh's Bharatiya Lok Dal in 1974.

Popularly known as "Rajaji," C. Rajagopalachari, the first Indian Governor General of India, was an ardent patriot, a pioneering social reformer, incisive thinker, profound scholar and author. He was also an eminent statesman and able administrator. He personified the ideal of simple living and high thinking. In the words of Jawaharlal Nehru, "Rajaji represents fundamentally the highest type of mind in India."

Born on December 10, 1878 in Tamil Nadu, Rajaji had his education in Bangalore and Madras. He qualified himself for the Bar and built up a lucrative practice. He attended the Surat Session of the Congress in 1907. He first met Gandhiji in 1919 and

participated in the Non-cooperation Movement in 1920. He led the Salt Satyagraha Campaign in the South in 1930 and was imprisoned for 9 months. Rajaji became the Prime Minister of Madras Presidency in 1937 but gave up office in 1939 following the Congress decision against cooperating with the British for unilaterally involving India in the Second World War.

He became a member of the Interim Government formed in 1946 at Delhi. On Independence, he became the Governor of West Bengal. In 1948, he became the first Indian Governor General. In 1952, he became the Chief Minister of Madras as a challenge to fight the communists in the Madras State Legislature. He relinquished office in 1954. He was given the highest National Award of "Bharat Ratna" in 1954.Rajaji was a champion of free enterprise, prohibition and disarmament. He went to the U.S. in 1962 as the leader of the Indian delegation to plead against the piling up of nuclear weapons in the world.

Rajaji was gifted with the rare talent of re-telling stories from the epics and the puranas. He wrote a number of books of enduring value as the Ramayana, the Mahabharata, the Gita and the Upanishads. He was an accomplished writer and speaker in English and Tamil. Rajaji died in 1972. Rajaji started to take part in the politics of the nation at the beginning of 1900's. At first he was drawn towards Bal Gangadhar Tilak. He had good relationship with V.O. Chidambaram Pillai, an ardent follower of Tilak. During Home Rule League days he admired Dr. Annie Besant and he highly revered Salem C.Vijayaraghavachariar, one of the founders of Congress. In the year 1919 Rajaji chose to follow Gandhi, who had just returned from South Africa. In the year 1921, Rajaji was selected as the General Secretary of the Congress Party and he came into close contact with Jawaharlal Nehru, Vallabhbhai Patel, Maulana Azad, Rajendra Prasad etc. and began to gain lime-light in the party.

At one time considered Mahatma Gandhi's heir, this brilliant lawyer from Salem, Tamil Nadu was regarded in pre-independence years as one of the top five leaders of the Congress along with Jawaharlal Nehru, Rajendra Prasad, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. Rajaji was also related to Mahatma Gandhi - as his daughter married Devdas Gandhi. Of the five,

Rajaji, Nehru and Patel were christened the "head, heart and hands" of Gandhi, in whose shadows they remained till his death.

Ironically, all three of them were to have a tempestuous relationship, bound together only by their common goal and Gandhi's charm. However, they respected each other immensely. Nehru wrote about Rajaji in his autobiography of how Rajaji's "brilliant intellect, selfless character, and penetrating powers of analysis have been a tremendous asset to our cause". Rajaji's intellect and political acumen is often compared with that of Chanakya. He had a very intimate relationship with Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Patel. Infact after his resignation as Governor-General he was called back to join Nehru's Cabinet mainly to work as a bridge between Nehru and Patel, a role in which he very well suited and succeeded after Mahatma Gandhi. Though in later years Rajaji developed differences with Nehru with regards to policy, their personal relationship remained unstrained.

Both had high regards and affection on each other. Sardar Patel had always identified Rajaji as one of his close companion, he always shared a cordial relationship with Rajaji. He was so open to Rajaji that he has shared his personal views about Nehru and his policy with him. Both of them were averse to Socialism.

Rajaji was perhaps the earliest Congress leader in the 1940s to accept the right of Muslims to self-determination. He devised a formula whereby there could be common defence and communications between the two nations. But the Rajaji formula was rejected by Jinnah as well as some Congress leaders. Rajaji was known to be a fierce defender of his political ideals, and did not hesitate to contradict his closest aides and friends in public, whenever he sensed a threat to them. After serving time in British prisons for his work in the independence movement, he became a member of the Governor's Council in 1946. In 1948, after Indian independence was attained, he replaced Mountbatten to become the only Indian Governor-General of India, in which post he continued till the Republic was declared on January 26, 1950. The office was replaced by that of President, first held by Rajendra Prasad. Rajaji became a member of Jawaharlal Nehru's cabinet, first without portfolio, then, after Patel's death, as Home Minister.

He was chief minister of Madras from 1952 to 1954. On leaving government, he was among the first recipients of the Bharat Ratna, the Indian government's highest civilian award.

Just ahead of the 1957, CR and his followers broke away from the Congress and formed the Congress Reform Committee. He came to an understanding with his former adversary, Forward Bloc leader U. Muthuramalingam Thevar, in forming an anti-Congress front. The two parties contested the elections jointly. In September CRC was renamed the Indian National Democratic Congress. CR made several literary contributions. His works in his native Tamil are recognized as modern classics (published and re-printed several times). After his break with politics, he started on the massive task of translating the Hindu Scriptures Ramayana, Mahabharata from Sanskrit to Tamil; and later into English. He received rave reviews from scholars and religious seers alike. He translated Upanishads and Bhaja Govindam into English.

His novels and short stories, themselves would have won him public adulation. He also translated 'The Tirukkural' from Tamil to English. 'Tirukkural' is an ancient piece of the Tamil literature and is often referred to as 'the flower of Tamilnad'. His ability as a writer, is in a sense, unparalleled, not just in India alone.

Some of his poetry was set to music and sung by Carnatic music's dominant personality M.S. Subbulakshmi at several occasions of importance, and once at the United Nations Kurai Onrum Illai - (meaning - No regrets have I My lord, None) is a very famous song in the semi-Carnatic music genre written by Rajaji and the most popular version, (widely acknowledged as soul-stirring) has been rendered by M.S. Subbulakshmi. Rajaji also composed a hymn which was sung in 1966 at the United Nations, again by M.S. Subbulakshmi. He was invited to the White House by President Kennedy; perhaps the only civilian, not in power, ever to be accorded formal state reception.[citation needed] The two discussed various matters and it is said that the great Indian statesman tried to impress the young President on the folly of an arms race - even one which the US could win.

The nonagenarian's public life, spanning nearly eighty years are perhaps best recognized by Mahatma Gandhi's rich tribute to him praising him as: "the keeper of my conscience". Rajaji died

in December, 1972 after a short illness. For those too young to remember The Quit India movement and the heady days fifty-five years ago when the Congress Party announced open revolt against the British Empire, the mental images that come to mind are solemn reminders of an age long vanished.

The heart-stirring images of disciplined volunteers clad in khadi stoutly courting arrest, of arrogant white sahibs brandishing lathis are the more obvious images of the last campaign of the freedom struggle. What one tends to forget is that the cry of `Quit India' was muffled by the British authorities only two to three months after the famous meeting at Gowalia Tank Maidan, and that the movement was hardly the example of non-violent satyagraha that our nostalgia might entertain. While the celebrations to commemorate the launch of the Quit India movement are taking place on August 09, the actual resolution was passed by the All India Congress Committee on August 7, 1942 and announced at a public meeting at the Gowalia Tank Maidan, the following morning. After much deliberation at the famous Working Committee session at Wardha on July 14, where Mahatma Gandhi expressed his frustration with the crumbs being offered to Indians in return for participation in World War II, a decision was taken to proclaim "open, unarmed revolt" (in Gandhiji's words). Tactics were not discussed, and the programme remained vague. The decision split the CWC, with C Rajagopalachari immediately resigning his membership. The consequences of the act were clear to all but the Mahatma.

To strike at the British during the opening of the war effort against Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan -- then still very much on the ascendant in Europe and Asia -- could doom the freedom struggle, as well as invite the easy conquest of British India by Japan, which was then marching across China and Southeast Asia. But Gandhiji, perhaps only by his charisma and stubbornness, carried the CWC with him, despite the complete lack of any strategic focus to the campaign.

The Congress Party, thus returned to Bombay -- in those days the centre of all political activity in the country -- to announce its final plan of action. The public meeting of the AICC gathered on a balmy Saturday morning on August 8 at the Gowalia Tank

Maidan, not far from a canopied statue of the Queen-Empress Victoria. The lakhs of khadi-clad volunteers and sympathisers who attended were in a state of rare enthusiasm, expecting as they were some great news. Great Britain was in a vulnerable state with German planes pounding London and the Japanese easily capturing the imperial outposts at Hong Kong and Singapore. When Gandhiji approached the dais to roars of applause and cheering, the assembled masses listened to a speech of rare militancy from the frail Mahatma:

"Every one of you should from this moment onwards consider yourself a free man or woman and act as if you are free...I am not going to be satisfied with anything short of complete freedom. We shall do or die. We shall either free India or die in the attempt."

Gandhiji was clearly stating his demands, and thus ended the dithering that had characterised the freedom struggle he had led since the twenties. He dared Great Britain to leave India to God or anarchy, and exhorted the masses to use their individual initiative to achieve freedom. "The problem was that no one really knew what he meant, whether to smash street lamps or derail trains," says M V Kamath, veteran journalist, who was present at the meeting. Gandhiji and the entire Congress leadership including Pandit Nehru and Maulana Azad were quietly arrested in the morning hours of August 9, 1942.

The British were taking no risks in retaining their hold over India, whose order and security were central to the war effort. The AICC and all Provincial Congress Committees were declared illegal under the Defence of India Act, and the Party's offices throughout the country were raided, their assets confiscated, and their publications banned. When news of the arrests spread, there was a tremendous response. Spontaneous demonstrations broke out, and as people gathered on the Maidan and at Shivaji Park the next morning, the police opened fire, killing nine people and wounding 169 others. One unidentified woman was able to unfurl the national tricolour moments before (whether Aruna Asaf Ali or the daughter of Dadabhoy Naoroji, it is still disputed).

Mob violence was reported all over the city. Matunga station was attacked, a railway van at Dadar Central was torched, and

the suburban railway was disrupted. Workers demonstrated at Parel, schools and colleges were closed by students, and government offices including post and telegraph offices, railway godowns, and the Income Tax Department were attacked and in some cases, bombed.

While disciplined Congress cadres proceeded non-violently, more often students, workers and lumpen elements resorted to confrontation and bloodshed to express their anger. The movement had catalysed these sections, and not the middle or upper classes, into action.

Within two months the protests had largely died down in Bombay City, due to quick police and Army response, preventive detention and arrests.

Absent in leadership, and all the while suffering from a lack of strategic planning and foresight, the movement quickly collapsed. Underground pamphleteering and radio broadcasts ended within several months of the announcement, and Gandhiji apologised from prison for unleashing such "madness". Salutary protests however continued, such as the sight of three women squatting on railway platforms throughout the country, each dressed in saffron, white and green saris.

In the following years, Bombay turned into the munitions and supply centre for the Allied forces in Asia, and the port witnessed spectacular growth in this time, as did industry and trade throughout the country, leaving independent India with a very favourable balance of trade after the War. While throughout the War expectation was in the air, even by its end no one was quite sure whether Independence would come. It was at this time, with Great Britain exhausted and bankrupt and its far-flung Empire now untenable, that the election of the Labour Government of Clement Attlee promised Independence to India, and that too under very different circumstances than in 1942. With the despatch of Lord Mountbatten to India began the closed-door negotiations and byzantine wrangling that delivered an impatient and raging India, tearing itself in half, to its tryst with destiny.

2

Madan Mohan Malviya

MAKER OF MODERN INDIA

Pt. Madan Mohan Malaviya popularly known as just Mahamana is the front leader of our nation. He commanded equal respect from the educated as well as the masses. Except Gandhiji and Lokmanya Tilak, there was no other leader popular like him. He was highly learned and cultured person. Modesty and grace were hallmark of his personality. He was the first public speaker of his time with thorough command over Sanskrit, Hindi, and English.

He was endowed with a good physique and impressive personality. Not only in dress but in food habits and life style also he was simplicity personified. He had deep faith in religion. He utilized fully modern educational system and means in his best creation Banaras Hindu University which according to him is actually an all India University. His very life was a great inspiration for the youth. The masses could reach him easily unlike any other leader of his stature. People could talk freely as though he were their father, brother or friend. Service to the poor and afflicted was the ideal and fact of his life. Public service was no mere means for popularity and prestige. He occupied a peerless position in pre-Gandhi an era in sociopolitical sphere and even during Gandhi's time. He command same confidence among the people as before. Despite possessing such' power and prestige he was extraordinarily modest. He did not have an iota of arrogance.

Gandhiji considered him as an elder brother and would call him "Maker of Modem India". Nehru said, "He was a great soul,

one of those who laid foundation of Modern Indian Nationalism". On another occasion he said, "Right since the beginning of Congress he had the special identity in our national movement. He played a great role in starting, making and developing it. He was certainly in forefront in Indian politics and also provided a link. He would link the extremists and the moderates in Congress Party. He was not of protesting nature. It is laudable that despite his firm opinion and views he would try to bring people together.

Among the great leaders of his time he paid most attention to our ancient culture. It is good Otherwise too. But in context of the time it was even better since the country had lost track... Then too there were many scholars of Sanskrit and culture but I feel that Malaviyaji was greatest among them in this regard. He could stop the onslaught of Anglicism, not by protest but by action. and thought and would try to further his culture his greatest accomplishment is establishment of Banaras Hindu University, a great thing. The University had an aim, an objective to relate modern industry and technology with ancient Indian culture. In a way it was a great work for India. Even now, for it is not the work of a day or two".

EARLY LIFE

Four and a half years after India's first battle for freedom in 1857 on 25th December 1861 on Wednesday, Madan Mohan was born in Laldiggi locality of Allahabad. His grandfather Pt. Premdhar was a great Sanskrit scholar. Like him. his gtandmother was deeply religious and gracious. Madan Mohan's parents Pt. Baijnath and Mrs. Meena Devi had six sons and two daughters. Among his siblings Madan was most talented. The child Madan was deeply influenced by family economic condition, parental affection, grandparents' religiosity. His life would shape in religiosity, grace and service to the poor and society. On his 75th birthday he had said, "My parents and grandparents were deeply religious, virtuous and unselfish Brahmins. I could do whatever I did but for their influence".

His education began at the age of five. He was sent to a Mahiijani school [Native school particularly teaching arithmetic to produce accountants]. Later, he went to religious school of

Haradevaji where he studied Sanskrit and ancient scriptures. Under Haradevaji's guidance the adolescent Madan's mind was greatly influenced by Hindu religion, Indian culture and sansakaras. Government High School was founded in 1868in Allahabad and Madan joined it with his mother's permission. After doing High School despite financial hardship he took admissiqn in Muir Central College. At sixteen he got married to Kundan Devi of Mirzapur. He was ever contented with his wife and proud of her.

TEACHING & SOCIAL SERVICE

After taking B.A. Degree in 1884 he joined his alma mater as a teacher on a salary of Rs. 40/- pm. He wanted to study further but could not because of poverty of his family. He proved a successful teacher. Encouraged by his guru, Prof. Adityarama Bhattacharya, Madan started his public life from 1880 and worked a lot for Prayaga Hindu Samaj (Society). He also contributed articles on religion and contemporary subjects to the Hindi Pradeepa edited by Pt. Balakrishan Bhatta. In 1882, taking the vow of Swadeshi (indigenous) he propagated the idea. In 1884, Hindi Uddharirii Pratinidhi Sabha (Hindi Promotion Society) was established and Madan became its prominent worker. In 1885, Prof. Bhattacharya brought out an English weekly, the Indian Union. Much of editorial work was done by Madan.

EARLY PUBLIC LIFE

In the last week of December 1886, Madan with Prof. A.R. Bhattacharya went to Calcutta to participate in Second Conference of Indian National Congress where supporting Sri Surendra Nath Banerjee's resolution he gave a brilliant speech, a specimen of felicity and linguistic acumen. Conference President Dada Bhai Nouroji said that through this young man Mother India herself spoke. Sri, S. N. Banerjee called it the best speech which left deep impression on the delegates. The speech projected him as the future Congress leader. Mr. A. O. Hume in his report wrote that the listeners were lost in the speech. In a large gathering of Hinciusin Haridwar in 1887 was established Bharat Dharma Mahamandal Soon Madan was considered one of its great preachers. For about fifteen years he was closely associated with

it and delivered lectures on Hinduism and Indian culture under its auspices.

The Calcutta Congress speech impressed Raja Ramapal Singh of Kalakankar of Pratapagarh district so much that he requested him to edit the Hindi daily Hindosthan brought out by him. In July 1887 relinquishing teaching he joined the Daily as its editor and the paper became very popular. His editorials and comments on contemporary problems were balanced and inspiring. Observing editorial propriety, supporting truth, asserting national interest, and criticism without personal attack characterized his journalism. Even Government acknowledged popularity of the paper. The Raja was fully satisfied with his work and had great regard for him.

While at Kalakankar he would come to Allahabad every week and participate in national politics to the extent possible. In 1887 he took a contingent of 40 delegates from V.P. to the Madras Congress. He was appointed President of State Political Association and permanent member of Executive Committee. On his invitation the next Congress was fixed for Allahabad.

In 1889 he came back to Allahabad and under Pt. Ayodhyanath's stewardship joined the English daily Indian Opinion as Coeditor. He also joined LLB. Course.

LEGAL PRACTICE

Passing LL.B. Examination in 1891, he started legal practice at District Court of Allahabad with Pt. Beniram Kanyakubja. Gradually his professional skill improved. Certainly practice at the High Court of Allahabad could fetch him both fame and money, had he done so, and led a comfortable life. According to Sir Tei Bahadur Sapru, "Within a few years he achieved fame in Civil Law and he'd rank after Pt. Sundar Lal, Pt. Moti Lal Nehru, and Shree Chaudhari. Soon he became a brilliant Civil lawyer". But wealth could not fetter him. National service would be his main work. In 1908 he cut down his professional engagement and in 1910 he decided to quit it. Finally in 1913 he bade goodbye to the Court and Law. Giving up established practice to serve the country is certainly the highest example of sacrifice. Sri Gokhale said, "Malaviyaji's sacrifice is real one. Born in a poor family, he

started earning thousands monthly. He tasted luxury and wealth but giving heed to call of the nation renouncing all he again embraced poverty".

The most important achievement in this decade by him was to get government acceptance of use of devanagari script in court works. In November 1889 with efforts of Pt. B.K. Bhatt and zeal of many youths, a library Bharati Bhavan was established near Madan's residence. During his legal practice he did a lot of public work in Allahabad and enriched the cultural, sociopolitical and economic life. He was senior Vice-President of Municipal Board and his association continued up to 1916. He collected donation touring the province to raise money to build a hostel for Hindu students. And'in 1903, the hostel, known today as Hindu Hostel, was built at the cost of Rs. 2.50 lacs. In 1907, he organised D.P. Industrial Conference in Allahabad and established Prayag Industrial Association. On the Vasanta Panchami of 1907 he began publishing a Hindi weekly the Abhyudaya to propagate his political and cultural views. For two years he edited it and then handed over editorship to Rajarshi [an honorific] Purushottam Das Tandon.

PUBLICATION OF THE LEADER

On 24th October 1919, the day of Vijaya Dashami, the first issue of the English daily, Leader came out. Along with cooperation of many friends, Pt. Moti Lal Nehru, Chairman and Managing Committee, played an important role. In 1911, Sri C.Y. Chintamani took over as the editor. In October 1910, Madan gave presidential speech in the 1st Conference of Hindi Sahitya Sammelan.

WORK IN CONGRESS

The main forum for Madan's political activities was Congress. According to Sri c.y. Chintamani, "In early twenty years in D.P., Madan alone with help of Sri Ganga

Prasad Varma raised Congress flag. He presided over the 1918 Delhi and the 1919 Lahore Congress. From 1903 to 1918 as M.L.C., he served the province. In 1910, elected by non-government members, he went to Central Council and worked upto 1920. He reviewed in a constructive manner Government's military,

administrative and financial policies and activities. As elected member of the Indian Legislative Assembly he served the nation from 1924 to 1930". Right from its inception he had been a front running active leader of the Congress. In the annual conference of 1908, he supported the resolution that welcomed proposed political reforms like expansion of legislative councils, improvement of their works and rights, appointment of Indians in Executive Councils and strengthening autonomous governance. Opposing election proposal on communal basis, he said, "Electing representatives on basis of religion is unnecessary and impossible".

He played an important role in the then political reforms and presented a correct nationalist perspective. He did significant work as an active member of different committees regarding the changing indigenous conditions and solution to social, economic, political problems of the country; As member of the Industrial Commission 1916-1918, he showed deep concern at industrial decline of India. Right from the beginning to 1937-38, participating in almost all annual and special sessions of Congress he came out as a great thinker and fighter in context of different national problems. He remained ever a fighter for country's politico-intellectual and cultural emancipation. Opposition of the Rowlatt Act, vehement opposition of the Jaliawalah massacre, formation of Congress Swaraj Party, Nationalist Party, and Swadeshi Organizations, Ekata Conference made endless saga of his fighting spirit. Joining Congress in second year of its inception and being active through out for half a century is a unique example of Madan. Perhaps then was none like him in the history of Congress. He achieved fame just after joining the party and he attained top national stature easily for which neither he craved nor wished to achieve any office. The national party by offering him Presidentship in the 1909, 1918, 1930, and 1932 Congress acknowledged his leadership.

It is remarkable that during his long political career his influence never waned. Many of his contemporary national leaders lost their glory after a few decades, lagged behind in national politics or could not carry on, but not Madan; his leadership never lost its lustre. He was once again given Congress stewardship during a period that was the phase of Government repression. He

more than 70 years, gladly accepted the responsibility, 'went to jail and suffered great pain. He fully discharged responsibility given to him by the party.

Basically his political ideology was moderate. He continued to believe in his initial views that he had formed in first three decades of his political career. That is why, he participated enthusiastically in State and Central Assemblies, gave long speeches and tried to influence British Government. When the National Movement changed its form in Gandhian era he did not hesitate to work accordingly. He was fully committed to the Civil Disobedience Movement. By the end of the Dandi March, he left Indian Legislative Assembly and tried his best to make the movement a success and in its first phase also went to jail. After the Gandhi Irvin Pact, he went to London to take part in the Round Table Conference. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapro in his memoirs writes, "No other Indian in the conference commanded as much respect from British politicians as he. In second phase of the movement, he played active role to guide mass struggle".

The pivotal role that he played in nation's service is a glorious chapter in history of the Congress. His prime objective was country's liberation. To his last breath, he dedicated himself to the nation with memorable degeneration.

In 1937, he left active politics for good. The occasion was the meeting of AlCC (All . India Congress Committee) after provincial elections which considered the proposal for forming cabinet by Congress. He thought that the vow taken during elections and keeping it in view wants in the new system, Congress should not take responsibility of governance by forming cabinet. Leaders like Jawahar Lal Nehru, Acharya Narendra Deva too had the same view but the majority wanted to rule. At such a juncture, Madan instead of owning a new controversy in his 76th year, blessing the young blood in AICC meeting, he bid farewell to active politics.

LIBERAL HINDUISM & SIMPLE HINDI

He was unhappy with activities, claims and demands of the Muslim League. He was also unsatisfied with social policy of the Government. But he was not in favour of forming a rural Hindu political party outside Congress. He wanted to spread the basic

live principles of the Sanatan Dhanna among the Hindu masses and to make them aware of their duties and thereby energize and put life in the society. He founded Sanatan Dharma Sabha to provide forum to spread basic Principle's of Dhanna. He inspired the Hindus through his articles, speeches and discourses.

On 10th October 1910, in Banaras, he chaired 1st Conference of Hindi Sahitya Sammelan and requested Hindi-speaking people to learn the language. Let all Indian languages develop. Let Urdu lovers work for development of Urdu and Hindi lovers work for Hindi. He said, "Better both Hindi and Urdu are brought at one place to the extent possible and if efforts are made from both parties much is possible to bring the two as one".

BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY

The Banaras Hindu University is the living picture of Madan's philosophy of education.' The dedication with which he founded the University proves that he showed exemplary capability to achieve his objective. Right from the beginning he had the vision of a great fully developed University. The University is the symbol of his ambition. What is remarkable is his unique synthesis of tradition and modernity in his educational system. He gave equal importance to both. From every point of views it was progressive and modern. That is why after Independence the number of 'engineers and technocrats produced by the University is more than that by any other institution in the country. Advanced science education was available here - right form the beginning.

The University has always had leading position in nationalism. In National Movement both teachers and students here were always ahead of other educational institutions. During ,the Civil Disobedience Movement, Central Government stopped financial assistance. Many a time officers pressurized to control nationalist spirit in the University but Madan did not yield. In November 1930, on his advice the University wrote a letter clearly saying, "Patriotism is a powerful upsurge whose growth requires cooperation of the University...it is unexpected that during National Movement teachers and students would remain unaffected by nationalism". Confidential Government files confirm detail reports of political activities going on in the University which shows that

the University has ever been providing shelter and facilities to freedom fighters.

The active and effective role played by the University during the 1942 Quit India Movement could be possible only because the basis for national awakening was already here a decade earlier. Madan directly and indirectly influenced and affected it. He made the institution a major centre of national awakening.

He gave much emphasis on spreading and providing form of education because he considered it the major part of cultural revival. He was influenced by cultural revival of India during the last decades of the 19th century which finds expression in his speeches, thought and beliefs that enlivened many nationalists of his era. It was the period of the Indian Renaissance during which national leaders awakened self-confidence and self-respect among Indians. His works were manifestation of this basic vision. He paid special attention to our cultural heritage, took inspiration from our glorious history of India and worked ever to arouse love for Indians. That is why he emphasised upon development of Indian languages and maximum use of Sanskrit.

He made education the prime means for national awakening. He was determined to establish Banaras Hindu University even before achieving national stature of leadership. More than a decade after 1905, he was engrossed in establishing the University. After that his main task was development of the University. That is why Gandhi said, "His greatest accomplishment is the Banaras Hindu University": He wanted an educational system that would shape character of {ndian youths, increase their faith in Indian culture and enliven them with patriotism and national service.

In the 21st Banaras Congress in December 1905, he made public declaration of establishing the University. He had been thinking over its form and character for some time. By now, he had prepared the plan for the proposed university and put it before all in print. This gave important educationists and nationalists opportunity to express their views on the form of the University. He came to know of their views and opinions and consequently improved and revised plan and he published the revised project in 1911. He had prepared both drafts himself. Looking into them we can see how much pains he had undertaken

to envision and accomplish the University. It is remarkable that proving necessity of the University, he first threw light on the problem of country's increasing poverty and ignorance and then compared India with European countries. He pointed out the continuous decline of average earning of Indians. Whereas illiteracy percentage in U.K. is 5%, in Germany 1%in India it is 95%. To improve this sorry state he called on necessity of establishing University. He had declared that the main objective of the University would be the study of morality, religion, and ancient culture. The only solution to eliminate country's backwardness and decline is scientific development. Referring to prosperity of USA and Europe, he pointed out development of steam and electric power and contribution of technology by scientists. Look what he had said in the 1905 document: "The millions mired in poverty here can only get rid when sciences used their interest.

Such maximum application of science is only possible when scientific knowledge is available to Indians in their own country". Obviously, in Madan's plan the main objective was to provide scientific knowledge and study to Indian youths. He considered science the key to prosperity. He had two alternatives before him regarding the basic form of the University: first, a University recognised by Government to function under its control; second, a University totally free from Government control. From the beginning he chose the first and from this point of view made changes in his first draft, one of which was to decide that medium of instruction would be English. First, he wanted Hindi as its medium but later keeping in view the situation and time he changed his views because the Government was not prepared to recognise the University having Hindi medium of instruction. Therefore, he readily agreed but then he wanted to gradually shift to Hindi medium.

The other distinguishing characteristic of the proposed University was to make it fully residential, whereas all other existing Universities in India-Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Lahore, Allahabad-were merely affiliating Universities conducting examinations. His vision was a University where 10 thousand students live together and think over collectively for development and progress of society and nation. It was the first University to

come out of private efforts. The other existing ones were Government creation. Here every thing was to be done by one single man, Madan.

Government put the condition of a large amount of money before granting recognition, besides other conditions. One can easily visualise the challenges but patiently he devoted all his energy and resources to establish the University. His ambitious plan was in accordance with his courageous personality. He was not satisfied with a small ordinary educational institution. He had dreamed of a university where every discipline of learning, science, technology and indology would be taught. BHU was the first university where began modem education of technology. He had thought about it beforehand. He was not one to be satisfied by mere planning. Just after establishment of the university he devoted himself for its all rounded growth and development.

By preparing an acceptable draft proposal of the university, he had created basis for cooperation of influential sections of country. He knew well that for realising his dream wide support of society was necessary. For about five years, he was busy collecting donation. The government could grant recognition only after a sum of 50 lacs was available. For raising the sum, he travelled to different parts of the country, met both the rich and the poor appealing them to donate generously for a noble cause. And he succeeded in his mission in 1915. In. .March 19I5, Education Member presented the University Bill in Central Legislative Council. There was debate on it twice. As member of Council, he clarified doubts of members. The main point of debate was teaching of religion and the impression of communalism. Clarifying this misapprehension, he said, "My Lord, the University will be a denominational institution, but not a sectarian one.

It will not promote narrow sectarianism but a broad liberation of mind and a religious spirit which will promote brotherly feeling between man and man. Unfortunately we are all aware that the absence of sectarian religious Universities, the absence of any compulsory religious education in our State Universities, has not prevented the growth of sectarian feeling in the country. I believe, my Lord, instruction in the truths of religion, whether it would be Hindus or Mussulmans, whether it be imparted to the students

of the Benares Hindu University or of the Aligarh Moslem University, will tend to produce men who, if they are true to their religion, will be true to their God, their King and their country. And I look forward to the time when the students who will pass out of such Universities, will meet each other in a closer embrace as sons of the same Motherland than they do at present".

Government cooperation was sought for the development of the University. That is why he invited the Viceroy to lay the Foundation in February 1916 where several governors, kings, feudal lords, educationists and national leaders gathered. The main aim of the ceremony was to seek cooperation of the Government and the rich.

Madan sought help from both, the rich and the poor. On the occassion, Gandhi who had just come back from Africa gave an important speech whose some words were objected to by Mrs. Annie Besant and King of Darbhanga. But Madan!

transcending all controversies, winning cooperation of all succeeded in establishing the University. From very beginning, he tried to make the University nationalistic. He sought worthy teachers from every region and community, even from foreign country. He was the Vice Chancellor for two decades, 1919-1939.He had not thought that he himself would have to head the university but during initial three years whoever headed the Banaras Hindu University left it for various reasons. Consequently, he had to take up the job. And once he took over this responsibility, he carried it further.

Different buildings of the University were built under his instruction. He devoted his body and soul to make the University the greatest and most useful seat of learning. The University moved on the path of development by his efforts.

The University was established to synthesize ancient and modern knowledge. For traditional learning, he established a separate college, now known as Faculty of Sanskrit Vidya and Dharma Vijnan. The University not only aimed at politico-economic independence but also intellectual independence. That is why it has remained a creative forum for synthesis of nationalism, culture and intellectual freedom.

During Silver Jubilee Celebrations of the University in 1948, the Vice Chancellor, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan said, "Here we have not a bit of stone, but a whole landscape. If only nature could have life and memory, the stones of Benares would be able to repeat the words of Veda Vyasa, of the Rishis of the Upanishads, the sermons of Buddha, the message'of the Gita and the sayings of hundreds of saints and teachers who have, lived in this neighbourhood. Is it possible for us to think of a more suitable site for the development of the Hindu University? And is it possible for us to think of a guide, protector and director of all our activities, nobler than our venerable Rector, selfless, loyal, gentle but not weak, determined but not aggressive, a spirit as clean as the mountain air? He has lighted a lamp here, whose light will penetrate far into space and time and will not be put out, by God's grace, as long as civilization lasts. In a world where men strive and gods decide, no better combination of place and personality could have been thought of. It is a matter of great rejoicing that on his 81st year, he is with us to witness the celebration of the Silver jubilee of his pet child. May I on behalf of the Indian nation, its princes and people offer our prayerful gratitude for his life work and wish him in the words of the Vedas "Jivema Sharadashatam". May he live for a hundred autumns".

This milestone of Indian history is one man creation. This "capital of learning" is an epoch making creation of Madan's revolutionary thought. In words of Col. Wedgewood, "It is a great achievement of Indians in the century" .

LAST DECADE

He remained the Vice Chancellor from November 1919 to September 1939. He could not carry on heavy responsibility because of his failing health. Ultimately, he decided to step down. The University Court accepted his resignation and formally elected Dr. S. Radhakrishnan to step into his shoes and appointed Madan life Rector. Despite not keeping well he would help') and inspire students to the utmost. He would regularly attend the Sunday's Gita Discourse. But he'd be unhappy to find students uninterested in it. He'd frequently visit Shivaji Hall (university gymnasium) and be happy to see well-built youths and bless them. Maintaining

body and physical culture would be his particular subject to speak about. He'd inspire students for physical culture. He had great love for students. Affection was his life force. More than lofty buildings and natural beauty of the campus, hustle bustle of students would please him most. They alone were source of hope and contentment amid his physical suffering and wornes.

Even after freedom from active politics and university administration, he maintained his old association with Sanatan Dharma Sabha whose office was at his residence where from carne out the weekly Sanatan Dharma. The office would encourage and award religious scholars and work for cow protection and welfare. In 1941, he founded and got registered Goraksha Mandala [Cow Protection Society] which propagated cow protection and organisation of cow shelters in Bihar, V.P. and C.P. [Madhya Pradesh], and celebration of Cow Week every year from Kartikshukla Pratipadato Ashtami. [in light fortnight of October-November]. One of its main tasks was establishment and management of cow shelter in Chyavan Ashrarna in Shivapur [a suburb of Varanasi]. Among his social service corne emancipation of outcasts, widow marriage and savama marriage etc.

EMANCIPATION: LAST JOURNEY FOR THE ULTIMATE

He would not keep well after kiiyiikaJpa[an ayurvedic therapy for rejuvenation] yet he pulled on. And finally on November 12, 1946 in twilight he breathed his last. The news spread like wildfire. People broke down. The great light was out. The soul merged with the Oversoul. The city came under heavy pan of gloom. The University, his most prized creation, was closed for ten days. Condolence meetings were held all over India. His last journey is a historic event for Banaras. Mahatma Gandhi on his tour to Noakhali wrote, "He is immortaL.his labour from youth to ripe old age has made him immortal. He was servant to his followers. Reconciliation was in his nature...his life was epitome of the holy. He was the image of mercy and softness". Back in 1931, Gandhi had written, "Who can vie him in patriotism. Right from youth till now his patriotism is unbroken".

Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru said, "We are greatly grieved that we'd no more see the bright star that illuminate our life, inspired

us since childhood and taught us to love Mother India". Dr. Rajendra Prasad wrote, "A great soul has left us. His name and work would inspire future generation and give message that for a determinedpersonnothingis impossible.

His service to nation is beyond words. The vacuum created by his death can't be filled. He was a real patriot". Acharya Narendra Deva in a condolence meeting in Falzabad said, "He was the glorious pillar of India. His patriotism and national service would ever give new zeal to Indians. He gave up legal practice at can of the nation. He rendered valuable service by spreading education in the country. Hindu University is now his best memorial".

Sri Rafi Ahmad Kidwai said, "In his death the nation has lost a great builder". Sardar Abdulkhan Nishtar said, "His death has deprived national stage of a great man. He was not only a great jurist but also a great reformer and propagator of education".

MAHAMANA MALAVIYA

Patriotism and religious faith were two basic mantras of his life. Their excellent synthesis was his characteristic virtue. He believed that, "Religion is merely to transform the brute in man into the divine. Development of the human is actually the divine and God and selfless service to all beings is true worship of God". He worked all his life for mobilising resources for public service and was called "Prince among beggars". A great patriot, wise man with blamishless public life, servant to the masses, epitome of compassion and goodwill, excellent orator, modest, loving all beings, lover of fine arts, living a simple life-Madan contained all these. According to Rajarshi Purshottam Das Tandon, he was an ideal person who did epoch-making work in politics and education. The famous scientist Sir P.c. Roy said, "Next to Gandhi, it is difficult to find anyone who sacrificed so much and did such multifarious works as he. "

According to Sri C.Y. Chintamani, he alone can be bracketed with the saint of Sabarmati [GandhI"].Pt. Hridaya Nath Kunjaru said, "Except Gandhi there has been no greater Indian than he".

That is why the country loved him calling "Mahamana Malaviya". On his centenary, Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru said:

"When we remember such great man let us learn and benefit from his life. We can learn a lot from his heritage What is history of world? A lot. But if we could summarise, world history is nothing but biographies of great persons. In a way it is true. There are many other things but perhaps this is most important.

Although he was a strong supporter of the Congress he founded the Hindu Mahasabha in 1906. It was established, according to its supporters, to oppose not the just claims of the Muslim community but the "divide and rule" policy of the British Government. Malviya became a High Court Vakil in 1893. He always gave preference to public work over his legal work. He virtually withdrew from the legal profession in 1909 but he made an exception in 1922 in regard to the appeal of 225 persons condemned to death in connection with the Chauri Chaura riots (Gorakhpur District, U.P.) on account of which Mahatma Gandhi suspended the civil disobedience movement, and saved 153 accused from the gallows.

Malaviya's zeal for public work made him realise the necessity of starting newspapers particularly in Hindi, for the education of the public. He started the Abhyudaya as a Hindi weekly in 1907 and made it a daily in 1915. He also started the Maryada a Hindi monthly in 1910 and another Hindi monthly, in 1921. He started the Leader, an English daily in October 1909. He was the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Hindustan Times from 1924 to 1946.

In consequence of the active work that he did as Senior Vice-Chairman of the Allahabad Municipality , he was elected to the Provincial Legislative Council in 1902. The ability and independence which marked his speeches in the Council led to his election in 1909 to the Imperial Legislative Council, of which he soon became one of the most important members.

He participated in the debates on important resolutions, e.g. those relating to free and compulsory primary education, the prohibition of recruitment of Indian indentured labour to the British colonies, nationalisation of railways, etc. He took a keen interest in the industrial development of the country and was therefore appointed a member of the Indian Industrial Commission in 1916.

In view of the non-cooperation movement started by Mahatma Gandhi in 1920, he did not seek election to the Indian Legislative Assembly in 1921. But he was a member of the Assembly from 1924 to April 1930. He resigned shortly after the salt satyagraha started by Mahatma Gandhi and took part in it. He supported the demand for the grant of full Dominion Status to India put forward by Pandit Motilal Nehru. He was invited to the Round Table Conference in 1931, but he inevitably returned dissatisfied with the attitude of the British Government.

The Benares Hindu University betrays the keen interest that he took in the education of the mind and the spirit. The importance that he attached to the economic development of the country made him combine the teaching of science and technology with that of religion.

Malaviya was a conservative in social matters. He believed in the 'Varnashrama Dharma' (caste system). He was, however, prepared to adjust himself to social changes in the country to a limited extent, but wanted to take the leaders of the Hindu community and the Benares pandits with him in matters of social reform. He felt strongly the injustice done to the depressed classes in connection with temple entry and pleaded their cause before the pandits in 1936. He also favoured the raising of the position of Hindu women.

We have many instances from which we may learn. Also from Malaviyaji's life-from his objective, his work and success. We can learn from all these. We may erect statues, form institution all right but ultimately we should learn from his life, his work and then follow his path and move forward. This can be his great memorial. It's good that we are celebrating his centenary. Let the old and young think again and consider what made him so great. How, he took the nation on path of freedom? How with due respect to his culture he took us ahead. How following his path we can serve India and move ahead".

3

Pherozeshah Mehta

Sir Pherozeshah Mehta (August 4, 1845 - November 5, 1915) was an Indian political leader, activist, and a leading lawyer, who was knighted by then British Government in India for his service to the law. He became the Municipal commissioner of Bombay Municipality in 1873 and its President four times - 1884, 1885, 1905 and 1911. He was chosen the president of Indian National Congress in 1890.

EARLY LIFE

Pherozshah Merwanjee Mehta was born on the 4th August 1845 in Bombay, to a Parsi business family. Graduating from the Elphinstone College in 1864 he passed the M.A. examination, with honors, six months later, being the first Parsi to have obtained a Master's degree from the University of Mumbai. He later went to England to study law at Oxford University.

In 1868 he returned to India and was admitted to the bar, and soon established a practice for himself in a profession which was till then dominated by British lawyers.

It was during a legal defence of Arthur Crawford he pointed out the need for reforms in the Bombay municipal government, and later he drafted the Bombay Municipal Act of 1872, and is thus considered the father of Bombay Municipality. Eventually, Sir Pherozeshah Mehta left his law practice to join politics.

POLITICAL AND SOCIAL ACTIVITIES

When the Bombay Presidency Association was established in 1885, Pherozeshah Mehta became its president, and remained so

for the rest of his years. He encouraged Indians to obtain western education and embrace its culture to uplift India. He contributed to many social causes for education, sanitation and health care in the city and around India.

Pherozshah Mehta was one of the founders of the Indian National Congress and its President in 1890, as its president he presided over Indian National Congress session held in Calcutta.

Pherozshah Mehta was nominated to the Mumbai Legislative Council in 1887 and in 1893 a member of the Imperial Legislative Council

In 1910, he started Bombay Chronicle, an English-language weekly newspaper, which became an important Nationalist voice of its time, and an important chronicler of the political upheavals of a volatile pre-independent India.

He saw through the British tactics of binding Parsi loyalty to the crown, by repeatedly making Parsis feel superior by showering them with decorations and praise, as by 1946 as many as 63 Paris had been knighted.

In his presidential address to Indian National Congress, he once said: "In speaking of myself as a native of this country, I am not unaware that, incredible as it may seem, Parsis have been both called and invited and allured to call themselves, foreigners." Pherozeshah Mehta died on November 5, 1915, in Bombay.

LEGACY

A portrait of Pherozshah Mehta at the Indian Parliament House, shows his importance in the making of the nation.

In Mumbai, even today Sir Pherozeshah Mehta is a much revered man, there are roads, halls and law colleges named after him.

He is respected as an important inspiration for young Indians of the era, his leadership of India's bar and legal profession, and for laying the foundations of Indian involvement in political activities and inspiring Indians to fight for more self-government.

In Mehta's lifetime, few Indians had discussed or embraced the idea of full political independence from Britain.

Sir Pherozeshah Mehta (1845-1915) was one of the founders of the Indian National Congress, a member of the Imperial Legislative Council of India, and an outstanding leader of the Bombay municipality.

Pherozeshah Mehta was probably born in Bombay, of respectable middleclass Parsi parents. He was one of the first Indians to secure Western higher education and the first Parsi to take the master's degree. He also became a barrister-at-law in London, where he absorbed the ideals of Gladstonian liberalism, which thereafter guided his political life.

By 1872 Mehta was prominent in the Bombay municipality, and it was to his leadership that the city owed its Magna Charta, the Act of 1888. The Duke of Connaught stated that the municipal constitution of Bombay was the product of Mehta's genius. Mehta was also the founder of the Bombay Presidency Association, which, under his tutelage from 1885 to 1915, was the organizational arm of the National Congress in Bombay. In 1886 he was appointed to the Bombay Legislative Council, where he was noted for his upright and independent character and his willingness to fight for a just cause. He also came to be noted as a splendid orator.

In 1911 Mehta was chosen president of the Bombay municipality, in which he had played so prominent a role for so many years. In 1898 he was named to the Imperial Legislative Council and served with distinction until poor health forced his resignation.

Mehta was active in the founding of the Indian National Congress in 1885. He continued to play a prominent role in the affairs of the Congress until his death. In 1890, and again in 1909, he was chosen president of the Congress. For undisclosed reasons he resigned the presidency a few days before the sessions began. On two other occasions he served as chairman of the important Reception Committee, which, in those days, dominated the proceedings.

A man of broad interests, Mehta was also an elected member of the senate of Bombay University and served on the board of several pioneer Indian business concerns. His career was summarized by a leading British journalist who said that Mehta

"had stood alone against the bureaucracy, had displayed a courage equal to Gokhale's, an eloquence hardly second to Surendranath Banerjea's, and power of sarcasm hardly rivaled by Motilal Ghoses's." He continued to exert great influence in the last years of his life. In 1914, when Gopal Krishna Gokhale was on the verge of arranging a harmonious resolution of the serious rift in the ranks of the Congress, it was Pherozeshah Mehta who sent an emissary to advise Gokhale against the move. Gokhale bowed to Mehta's opinion, and the rupture was not healed.

When Mehta died, the viceroy described him as "a great Parsi, a great citizen, great patriot, and a great Indian."

4

Lal Bahadur Shastri

Lal Bahadur Shastri (October 2, 1904 - January 11, 1966) was the third (second being Gulzarilal Nanda) Prime Minister of independent India and a significant figure in the Indian independence movement.

EARLY LIFE

Lal Bahadur was born in the year 1904 in Mughalsarai, Uttar Pradesh as Lal Bahadur Srivastava. His father Sharada Prasad was a poor school teacher, who later became a clerk in the Revenue Office at Allahabad. When Lal Bahadur was three months old, he slipped out of his mother's arms into a cowherd's basket at the ghats of the Ganges. The cowherd, who had no children, took the child as a gift from God and took him home. Lal Bahadur's parents lodged a complaint with the police, who traced the child, and returned him to his parents.

Lal Bahadur's father died when he was only a year and a half old. His mother Ramdulari Devi took him and his two sisters to her father's house and settled down there. Lal Bahadur stayed at his grandfather Hazari Lal's house till he was ten. Since there was no high school in their town, he was sent to Varanasi where he stayed with his maternal uncle and joined the Harischandra High School. While in Varanasi, Shastri once went with his friends to see a fair on the other bank of the Ganges. On the way back he had no money for the boat fare. Instead of borrowing from his friends, he jumped into the river and swam to the other bank.

As a boy, Lal Bahadur loved reading books and was fond of Guru Nanak's verses. He revered Bal Gangadhar Tilak, the Indian

nationalist, social reformer and freedom fighter. After hearing a speech of Mahatma Gandhi at Varanasi in 1915, he dedicated his life to the service of the country. He also dropped his surname, as it indicated his caste and he was against the caste system. During the non-cooperation movement of Mahatma Gandhi in 1921, he joined processions in defiance of the prohibitory order. He was arrested but let off as he was a minor. He then enrolled at the nationalist Kashi Vidyapeeth in Varanasi. During his four years there, he was greatly influenced by the lectures of Dr. Bhagawandas on philosophy. Upon completion of his course at Kashi Vidyapeeth in 1926, he was given the title Shastri ("Scholar"). The title was a bachelor's degree awarded by the Vidya Peeth, but it stuck as part of his name. He also enrolled himself as a life member of the Servants of the People Society and began to work for the upliftment of the Harijans at Muzaffarpur. Later he became the President of the Society.

In 1927, Shastri married Lalita Devi of Mirzapur. In spite of the prevailing hefty dowry tradition, Shastri accepted only a charkha and a few yards of khadi as dowry. In 1930, he threw himself into the freedom struggle during Mahatma Gandhi's Salt Satyagraha. He was imprisoned for two and a half years. Once, while he was in prison, one of his daughters fell seriously ill. He was released for fifteen days, on the condition that he not take part in the freedom movement. However, his daughter died before he reached home. After performing the funeral rites, he voluntarily returned to prison, even before the expiry of the period. A year later, he asked for permission to go home for a week, as his son had contracted influenza. The permission was given, but his son's illness was not cured in a week. In spite of his family's pleadings, he kept his promise to the jail officers and returned to the prison.

Later, he worked as the Organizing Secretary of the Parliamentary Board of U.P. in 1937. In 1940, he was sent to prison for one year, for offering individual Satyagraha to support the freedom movement. On August 8, 1942, Mahatma Gandhi issued the Quit India speech at Gowalia Tank in Mumbai, demanding that the British leave India. Shastri, who had just then come out after a year in prison, traveled to Allahabad. For a week, he sent instructions to the freedom fighters from Jawaharlal Nehru's home,

Anand Bhavan. A few days later, he was arrested and imprisoned until 1946. Shastri spent almost nine years in jail in total. During his stay in prison, he spent time reading books and became familiar with the works of western philosophers, revolutionaries and social reformers. He also translated the autobiography of Madam Curie into Hindi language.

IN GOVERNMENT

Following India's independence, Shastri was appointed Parliamentary Secretary in his home state, Uttar Pradesh. He became the Minister of Police and Transport under Govind Ballabh Pant's Chief Ministership. As the Transport Minister, he was the first to appoint women conductors. As the minister in charge of the Police Department, he ordered that Police use jets of water instead of lathis to disperse unruly crowds.

In 1951, he was made the General Secretary of the All-India Congress Committee, with Jawaharlal Nehru as the President. He was directly responsible for the selection of candidates and the direction of publicity and electioneering activities. He played an important role in the landslide successes of the Congress Party in the Indian General Elections of 1952, 1957 and 1962.

In 1951, Nehru nominated him to the Rajya Sabha. He served as the Minister of Railways and Transport in the Central Cabinet from 1951 to 1956. In 1956, he offered his resignation after a railway accident at Mahbubnagar led to 112 deaths. However, Nehru did not accept his resignation. Three months later, he resigned accepting moral and constitutional responsibility for a railway accident at Ariyalur in Tamil Nadu that resulted in 144 deaths. While speaking in the Parliament on the incident, the then Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, stated that he was accepting the resignation because it would set an example in constitutional propriety and not because Shastri was in any way responsible for the accident. Shastri's unprecedented gesture was greatly appreciated by the citizens.

In 1957, Shastri returned to the Cabinet following the General Elections, first as the Minister for Transport and Communications, and then as the Minister of Commerce and Industry. In 1961, he became Minister for Home. As Union Home Minister he was

instrumental in appointing the Committee on Prevention of Corruption under the Chairmanship of K. Santhanam.

PRIME MINISTER

Jawaharlal Nehru died in office on May 27, 1964 and left a vacuum. The then Congress Party President K. Kamaraj was instrumental in making Shastri as Prime Minister on June 9. Shastri, though mild-mannered and soft-spoken, was a Nehruvian socialist and thus held appeal to those wishing to prevent the ascent of conservative right-winger Morarji Desai.

In his first broadcast as Prime Minister, on June 11, 1964, Shastri stated:

"There comes a time in the life of every nation when it stands at the cross-roads of history and must choose which way to go. But for us there need be no difficulty or hesitation, no looking to right or left. Our way is straight and clear - the building up of a socialist democracy at home with freedom and prosperity for all, and the maintenance of world peace and friendship with all nations."

Shastri worked by his natural characteristics to obtain compromises between opposing viewpoints, but in his short tenure was ineffectual in dealing with the economic crisis and food shortage in the nation. However, he commanded a great deal of respect in the Indian populace, and he used it to advantage in pushing the Green Revolution in India; which directly led to India becoming a food-surplus nation, although he did not live to see it. During the 22-day war with Pakistan, Lal Bahadur Shastri created the slogan of "Jai Jawan Jai Kisan" ("Hail the soldier, Hail the farmer"), underlining the need to boost India's food production. Apart from emphasizing the Green Revolution, he was instrumental in promoting the White Revolution.

Greatly impressed by a visit to the Kaira district in October 1964, he urged the rest of the country to learn from the successful experiment at Anand. The National Dairy Development Board was formed in 1965 during his tenure as Prime Minister.

Though he was Socialist, Shastri stated that India cannot have a regimented type of economy. During his tenure as Prime Minister,

he visited Russia, Yugoslavia, England, Canada and Burma in 1965.

WAR WITH PAKISTAN

The chief problem for Shastri's administration was Pakistan. Laying claim to half of the Kutch peninsula, Pakistan sent incursion forces in August 1965, which skirmished with Indian tank divisions. In his report to the Lok Sabha on the confrontation in Kutch, Shastri stated:

"In the utilization of our limited resources, we have always given primacy to plans and projects for economic development. It would, therefore, be obvious for anyone who is prepared to look at things objectively that India can have no possible interest in provoking border incidents or in building up an atmosphere of strife... In these circumstances, the duty of Government is quite clear and this duty will be discharged fully and effectively... We would prefer to live in poverty for as long as necessary but we shall not allow our freedom to be subverted."

Under a scheme proposed by the British PM, Pakistan obtained 10%, in place of their original claim of 50% of the territory. But Pakistan's aggressive intentions were also focused on Kashmir. When armed infiltrators from Pakistan began entering the State of Jammu and Kashmir, Shastri made it clear to Pakistan that force would be met with force. Just in September 1965, major incursions of militants and Pakistani soldiers began, hoping not only to break-down the government but incite a sympathetic revolt. The revolt did not happen, and India sent its forces across the Ceasefire Line (now Line of Control) and threatened Pakistan by crossing the International Border near Lahore as war broke out on a general scale. Massive tank battles occurred in the Punjab, and while Pakistani forces made some gains, Indian forces captured the key post at Haji Pir, in Kashmir, and brought the Pakistani city of Lahore under artillery and mortar fire.

On 17 September 1965, while the Indo-Pak war was on, India received a letter from China. In the letter, China alleged that the Indian army had set up army equipment in Chinese territory, and India would face China's wrath, unless the equipments are pulled down. In spite of the threat of aggression from China, Shastri

declared "China's allegation is untrue. If China attacks India it is our firm resolve to fight for our freedom. The might of China will not deter us from defending our territorial integrity." The Chinese did not respond, but the Indo-Pak war resulted in great personnel and material casualties for both Pakistan and India.

The Indo-Pak war ended on September 23, 1965 with a United Nations-mandated ceasefire. In a broadcast to the nation on the day the of ceasefire, Shastri stated: "While the conflict between the armed forces of the two countries has come to an end, the more important thing for the United Nations and all those who stand for peace is to bring to an end the deeper conflict... How can this be brought about? In our view, the only answer lies in peaceful coexistence. India has stood for the principle of coexistence and championed it all over the world. Peaceful coexistence is possible among nations no matter how deep the differences between them, how far apart they are in their political and economic systems, no matter how intense the issues that divide them."

DEATH AT TASHKENT

After the declaration of ceasefire, Shastri and Pakistani President Muhammad Ayub Khan attended a summit in Tashkent (former USSR, now in modern Uzbekistan), organised by Kosygin. On January 10, 1966, Shastri and Khan signed the Tashkent Declaration. The next day Shastri, who had suffered two heart attacks earlier, died of a heart attack at 1:32 AM. He is the only Indian Prime Minister, and indeed probably one of the few heads of government, to have died in office overseas. Some conspiracy theories allege his death to be of unnatural causes.

MEMORIAL

All his lifetime, Shastri was known for honesty and humility. He was the first person to be posthumously awarded the Bharat Ratna, and a memorial "Vijay Ghat" was built for him in Delhi. Several educational institutes, roads, public squares and monuments in India are named after him. The Lal Bahadur Shastri Stadium in Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh is an example.

In 2005, the Government of India opened the Lal Bahadur Shastri Memorial and set up a library in New Delhi, as part of

the Lal Bahadur Shastri Centenary Celebrations. Doordarshan produced a docu-drama on his life, and a national award was instituted in his name. Also, a chair was created in his name in the field of democracy and governance in Delhi University.

PERSONAL LIFE

His sons Anil Shastri and Sunil Shastri are politicians.

Quotes

- "Jai Jawan, Jai Kisan" ("Hail the soldier, Hail the farmer")
- "If one person gives up one meal in a day, some other person gets his only meal of the day", spoken during the food crisis to encourage people to evenly distribute food.
- "Perhaps due to my being small in size and soft of tongue, people are apt to believe that I am not able to be very firm. Though not physically strong, I think I am internally not so weak."

Lal Bahadur Shastri (born 1904) succeeded Jawaharlal Nehru as Prime Minister of India in 1964. Though eclipsed by such stalwarts of the Congress party as Kamaraj (the Kingmaker) and Morarji Desai, Finance Minister in Nehru's government, Shastri emerged as the consensus candidate in the midst of party warfare. He had not been in power long before he had to attend to the difficult matter of Pakistani aggression, as represented by India, along the Rann of Kutch; and though a cease-fire under the auspices of the United Nations put a temporary halt to the fighting, the scene of conflict soon shifted to the more troubled spot of Kashmir. While Pakistan claimed that a spontaneous uprising against the Indian occupation of Kashmir had taken place, India charged Pakistan with fomenting sedition inside its territory and sending armed raiders into Jammu and Kashmir from Azad Kashmir. Shastri promised to meet force with force, and by early September the second Indo-Pakistan war had commenced.

Though the Indian army reached the outskirts of Lahore, Shastri agreed to withdraw Indian forces. He had always been identified with the interests of the working class and peasants since the days of his involvement with the freedom struggle, and now his popularity agree.

But his triumph was short-lived: invited in January 1966 by the Russian Premier, Aleksei Kosygin, to Tashkent for a summit with General Muhammad Ayub Khan, President of Pakistan and commander of the nation's armed forces, Shastri suffered a fatal heart attack hours after signing a treaty where India and Pakistan agreed to not meddle in each other's internal affairs and "not to have recourse to force and to settle their disputes through peaceful means. Shastri's body was brought back to India, and a memorial, not far from the national memorial to Mahatma Gandhi, was built to honor him. It says, in fitting testimony to Shastri, "Jai Jawan, Jai Kisan" ("Honor the Soldier, Honor the Farmer"). He is, however, a largely forgotten figure, another victim of the engineering of India's social memory by Indira Gandhi and her clan.

HIS ROLE IN THE FREEDOM STRUGGLE

At the age of 17, he was very impressed with Gandhiji's call for freedom through non - violence and so took part in the Non-co-operation Movement of 1921. He courted arrest but was let off because of his age. But he was not so lucky when he followed Gandhiji in the Satyagraha Movement and spent approximately 8 years in jail over a period of time. Even though he was made to undergo tremendous hardships, he survived with the help of his prayers and physical exercises. He spent this time reading different authors like Hegel, Kant, Marx, Russell and Lenin. He also did some translations and wrote about the Quit India Movement.

POST INDEPENDENCE

He served the Congress in various positions before becoming Prime Minister. He was First General Secretary, and then Home-Minister. In U.P. he made some progressive reforms in the police department, and in 1962, Pandit Nehru invited him to join the Union cabinet as a Minister for railways. A post from which he resigned after taking responsibility for a railway mishap, that happened during his tenure. Lal Bahadur Shastri showed remarkable abilities of oratorship and courage during the Indo - Pakistan War. He inspired his people through his leadership and offered them a slogan that has been passed down the ages - 'Jai Jawan Jai Kisan'. The Indo - Pak war would have continued,

but fortunately, the Russian Government intervened and both India and Pakistan were forced to sign the 'Tashkent Agreement' on January 11, 1966. A day that saw the passing away of this great leader, just a few hours after signing this historic agreement. He was awarded the 'Bharat Ratna' posthumously, in light of the services rendered to the country. His memorial 'Vijayghat' in delhi is a constant reminder of a great administrator and a fantastic human being.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF YOUNG MEN

19 December 1964

Whatever your station in future life, each one of you should first of all think of yourselves as citizens of the country. This confers on you certain rights, which are guaranteed by the Constitution, but it also subjects you to certain responsibilities, which also have to be clearly understood. Ours is a democracy, which enjoins freedom to the individual, but this freedom has to be subjected to a number of voluntary restraints in the interests of organized society. And these voluntary restraints have to be exercised and demonstrated in every-day life.

A good citizen is one who obeys the law, whether there is a policeman around or not, and who takes delight in performing his civic duties. In the olden days sense of self-restraint and discipline was inculcated by the combined effort of the family and the teacher. The economic stresses of present-day life unfortunately do not leave enough time to the parents to look after the children. In the educational institutions the numbers have grown so large as to take away the benefits, which used to accrue formerly by personal contact between the teacher and the taught. Inevitably, our young students are often left much to their own resources. Often this creates problems, which we all know about. This is an important aspect, which needs thorough examination. The responsibility of our young citizens is great. In my view every station in life is important in itself. Work has its own dignity and there is great satisfaction in doing one's own job to the best of one's ability.

Whatever the duties, we should apply ourselves with sincerity and devotion. Such an approach, apart from being good in itself,

also has the added advantage of opening avenues for further advancement. We have to see whether we have done our own job well before thinking of criticizing anybody else. All too often, we succumb to the temptation of decrying others without bothering to look to ourselves. Never forget that loyalty to the country comes ahead of all other loyalties. And this is an absolute loyalty, since one cannot weigh it in terms of what one receives. It is essential to remember that the entire country is one and that any one who fosters or promotes separatism or fissiparous tendencies is not our true friend. What I have said stems from a desire to see that the youth of our country prepares itself in a disciplined and determined manner for the responsibilities of tomorrow. A democratic country is sustained not by the greatness of a few but by the co-operative effort of the many.

The future of the country is in your hands and as the older generations complete their task the new ones come along to take their place. If they are well equipped as individuals and as citizens, the country's future will be bright indeed. At a time when you are at the threshold of a new period in your life I would urge you to play your role with confidence and dignity. Our position with regard to secularism is known so well that it hardly needs any reiteration. It is embodied in our Constitution, which ensures equal respect for all religions and equal opportunities for all citizens, irrespective of their caste and creed and the faith which they profess. In spite of a seeming diversity, there is a fundamental unity in India, which we all cherish and it has to be our constant endeavor to maintain and strengthen this unity.

The country can progress only if it does away completely with fissiparous tendencies and emerges as an integrated whole. And it is in the field of education that the seed of secularism has to be sown at the earliest stages, so that the plant can be carefully nurtured as it grows. The world is at the moment passing through very difficult times. In fact, it would not be wrong to say that never before in the recent past had mankind to grapple with problems of as complex a nature as are confronting it today.

It is imperative that satisfactory and, as far as possible, lasting solutions should be found to these problems without undue delay, otherwise there is a danger of the situation getting out of hand.

Mutual suspicions, hatred and ill-will between nations and groups of persons have to be removed at all costs and sincere and determined efforts have to be made to ensure that differences and outstanding problems are resolved by mutual discussion in a spirit of understanding, and not by the use of force. Wars and conflicts, as we know to our cost, always create more problems than they succeed in solving. The great advances made by science and technology, particularly in the field of nuclear and thermonuclear energy, have placed an almost unlimited power at the disposal of mankind. This power can be used either for constructive or for destructive purposes and it is up to us to try to derive the fullest possible benefit from it.

We, in India, have our own special problems. No one can deny that some of them are of a serious nature and must be tackled with vigour and determination. Our national objective has been defined clearly and unambiguously. We aim that every citizen should be provided with the basic necessities of life and should have complete freedom to lead the life of his or her own choice. We aim at a democratic society, strong and free, in which every citizen, irrespective of his religious belief, will occupy an equal and honoured place, and will be given full and equal opportunities for growth and service. We aim at the removal of untouchability and the doing away of the prevailing serious inequalities in status and wealth. We are opposed to the concentration of wealth in a few hands. Our rich cultural heritage extending over countless centuries is not the culture of this community or that but the synthesis of the cultures of the great peoples who lived here at various times in the past.

The objectives I have mentioned are by no means easy of achievement in their entirety. I know that we have met with only a limited degree of success so far, but we have to persevere until the goal is achieved. It must be remembered that the vast majority of Indians are extremely poor and it is only a small minority that live in relative comfort and have the benefit of university education and other worthwhile things. It is when we look at the Indian scene in such a perspective that Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Parsecs and others, instead of feeling that they are different, will together begin to put forth a tremendous effort to fight poverty,

to eradicate disease and banish illiteracy. The life of Lal Bahadur Shastri (1904-66), India's second Prime Minister and successor to Jawaharlal Nehru, is an absorbing saga of a little man who, while suffering the rigours of poverty in early life, rose to political eminence on the strength of moral principle. When Shastri died he left no house, no land, no money. But he did leave behind an example which is morally inspiring. In an age riddled with political corruption, his career of exemplary integrity possesses a very special relevance for contemporary India as well as the world.

Although Lal Bahadur Shastri's tenure as Prime Minister lasted only nineteen months, it was a period of high excitement and drama. Under Shastri's leadership India successfully fought a major war against Pakistan. This came as a tremendous boost to India after the China debacle three years earlier. This Indo-Pak war was followed by successful peace negotiations between the two countries at the famous Tashkent Conference, where after the ink scarcely dry after all the momentous signatures, Shastri died of a heart attack. Several social and political issues of national importance and international interest emerged or found successful resolution during the time that Shastri held political power in Nehru's cabinet, as well as when he took over the premiership of India. Upon hearing the news of the death of Lal Bahadur Shastri, one of the most perceptive comments were made by one of the outstanding and respected figures of Indian journalism at that time - Frank Moraes, editor of the Indian Express. In an editorial, he observed:

"The drama of Tashkent has been cruelly heightened by its tragic denouement. The sudden death of Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri is a grievous loss to India for never were his qualities of patience and persistence, of flexibility and firmness, more needed than today. Following in the wake of the incandescent figure of Jawaharlal Nehru, Shastriji's homely, homespun personality suffered by comparison in the early days of his prime ministership but with each successive month, as crisis followed crisis, he grew in confidence and strength until the last confrontation with Pakistan found him the country's prime minister in his own right. Tashkent added more than a cubit to his stature as a statesman. It revealed him as a diplomat of considerable finesse and skill.

Lal Bahadur had the wisdom which consists of commonsense in an uncommon degree, and this he revealed in growing measure in the brief nineteen months of his prime minstership. In that period he faced calmly and with resolution more successive crises than have come the way of most prime minsiters.

Foodgrain scarcity with rising prices posed the first menacing problem in his early days in office, and this was followed by growing tensions in Kashmir, culminating the in the detention of Sheikh Abdullah. Then came the Pakistani incursion in Kutch and attack on Kashmir accompanied by Communist China's increasingly minatory postures on our northern frontier. Lal Bahadur had a rare capacity for remaining imperturbable but acutely vigilant through the most threatening times, and something of this calmness and confidence he was able to convey to his countrymen, more especially in the later months of his prime ministership.

He was a leader who because of his unusual attributes was ideally suited to guide his country in a time of crisis and fluidity, and it is no derogation of aspiring contestants to the prime ministership to observe that he will be difficult to replace. Although not unconscious of his qualities, Lal Bahadur was a man of real humility in so far as he did not regard his own opinions omnipotent and immutable was prepared to listen to others and surprisingly often to defer to them. Politicians are notoriously prone to dot the capital I but nobody could accuse Shastriji of being self-centred. He was outgiving by temperament and training".

The above comment aptly summarises the life of a great man.

Dr. Radhakrishnan said "Lal Bhadur Shastri's case is an illustration of the strength of democracy in this country. From humble beginnings, without any advantage of birth, position or wealth, he rose to the highest position in the Government of the country. It is due entirely to his force of character and integrity of life. These things enabled him to rise to the top".

5

K. M. Munshi

Kanhaiyalal Maneklal Munshi (December 30, 1887 - February 8, 1971) was an Indian freedom fighter from the state of Gujarat. A lawyer by profession, he then turned to literature and politics.

Munshi was born on 30 December, 1887 in the town of Bharuch in Gujarat, and educated in Vadodara, where he excelled in academics. One of his teachers at Baroda College was Sri Aurobindo. Munshi later practised in Bombay High Court.

Munshi was an active participant in the Indian Independence Movement ever since the advent of Mahatma Gandhi. He joined the Swaraj Party but returned to the Indian National Congress with the launch of the Salt Satyagraha in 1930. He was arrested several times, including during the Quit India Movement of 1942. A great admirer of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Munshi served in the Central Legislative Assembly in the 1930s. In 1938, Munshi founded the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan in Bombay.

After the independence of India, Munshi was appointed the diplomatic envoy and trade agent to the princely state of Hyderabad, where he served until its accession in 1948. Munshi was on the ad hoc Flag Committee that selected the Flag of India in August 1947, and on the committee which drafted the Constitution of India under the chairmanship of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar. He and Purushottam Das Tandon were among those who strongly opposed propagation and conversion in the constituent assembly. He was also the main driving force behind the renovation of the historically important Somnath Temple by the Government of India just after independence.

Munshi separated from the Nehru-dominated Congress Party and joined the newly formed Swatantra (Freedom) Party led by Chakravarti Rajgopalachari, which was right-wing in its politics and pro-business, pro-free market economy and private property rights. The party enjoyed limited success, but eventually died out. Later, Munshi joined the Jan Sangh. He served as the Governor of Indian State of Uttar Pradesh from 1952 to 1957.

Besides being a politician and educator, K.M. Munshi was also an environmentalist. He initiated the Vanmahotsav in 1950, when he was Union Minister of Agriculture and Food, to increase the area under forest cover. Since then Van Mahotsav a week long festival of tree plantation is organised every year in the month of July all across the country and lakhs of trees are planted.

Munshi was also a litterateur with a wide range of interests. He is well known for his historical novels in Gujarati, especially his trilogy Patanni Prabhuta (The Greatness of Patan), Gujaratno Nath (The Ruler of Gujarat) and Rajadhiraj (The Emperor). His other works include Jay Somnath, Krishnavatara, Bhagavan Parasurama, and Tapasvini (The Lure of Power) a novel with a fictional parallel drawn from the Freedom Movement of India under Mahatma Gandhi.

Versatile", "a philosopher in action", "a man of great ideas and great courage", "a multi-faceted genius"-these are the ways in which friends and admirers described Dr. Kanhaiyalal Maneklal Munshi, the founder of Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.The versatility of Munshiji is seen in his roles as lawyer, creative writer, constitution-maker, freedom fighter, administrator, organization-builder and champion of Indian culture. Dr. Munshi looked upon himself as a "sea shell thrown up by the mighty flood of Indian renaissance."

He founded the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan along with a few friends late in 1938. He said, "We, the Bhavan's family, whether it is the smaller one or the larger one, must make every effort in restoring an awareness of these values-Satyam, Shivam and Sundaram-Truth, Love and Beauty-in personal and collective life." The Bhavan, in the words of Dr. Radhakrishnan, is the greatest monument of Munshi's life.

Born in Broach on December 30, 1887, Munshiji came under the influence of Sri Aurobindo while studying at Baroda College. A prize winner at the B.A. and LL.B. examinations, he enrolled himself initially as a Pleader and later as an Advocate in the Bombay Bar. He first joined Dr. Besant's All India Home Rule League in 1916 and later the Indian National Congress.

He married Lilavati Sheth in 1926 (who was one of his literary critics) after the death of his first wife, Atilakshmi Pathak, whom he married when he was just 13.

He was elected to the Bombay Legislative Council in 1927. He took part in the Salt Satyagraha in 1930 and was imprisoned for 6 months. In 1932 he was sentenced to two years' rigorous imprisonment. He was elected to the Bombay Legislative Assembly in 1937 and appointed the Home Minister in the first Congress Government. He served as India's Agent-General in Hyderabad when the Nizam was trying to keep his State independent of the Indian Union. He became a member of the Constituent Assembly in 1948. He was Food and Agriculture Minister of the Government of India in 1950. He was Governor of Uttar Pradesh during 1952-57. He resigned from the Congress and became the Vice President of the newly formed "Swatantra Party" standing for free enterprise. Till his death in 1971 he devoted all his energies to the building up of the Bhavan as the premier cultural organization of the country.

Dr. Munshi is reckoned as one of the luminaries of the Gujarati literature and established his reputation as an outstanding novelist, particularly of the historical romance. His "Kulapati's Letters," contributed to the Bhavan's Journal, were widely read and appreciated.

K.M. Munshi's novel Prithvi Vallabh was made into a movie of the same name twice. The adaptation directed by Manilal Joshi in 1924 was very controversial in its day: Mahatma Gandhi railed against it for excessive sex and violence. The second version was by Sohrab Modi in 1943.

Versatile", "a philosopher in action", "a man of great ideas and great courage", "a multi-faceted genius"-these are the ways in which friends and admirers described Dr. Kanhaiyalal Maneklal

Munshi, the founder of Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.The versatility of Munshiji is seen in his roles as lawyer, creative writer, constitution-maker, freedom fighter, administrator, organization-builder and champion of Indian culture.

Dr. Munshi looked upon himself as a "sea shell thrown up by the mighty flood of Indian renaissance." He founded the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan along with a few friends late in 1938. Born in Broach on December 30, 1887, Munshiji came under the influence of Sri Aurobindo while studying at Baroda College.

A prize winner at the B.A. and LL.B. examinations, he enrolled himself initially as a Pleader and later as an Advocate in the Bombay Bar. He first joined Dr. Besant's All India Home Rule League in 1916 and later the Indian National Congress. He married Lilavati Sheth in 1926 (who was one of his literary critics) after the death of his first wife, Atilakshmi Pathak, whom he married when he was just 13.

He was elected to the Bombay Legislative Council in 1927. He took part in the Salt Satyagraha in 1930 and was imprisoned for 6 months. In 1932 he was sentenced to two years' rigorous imprisonment. He was elected to the Bombay Legislative Assembly in 1937 and appointed the Home Minister in the first Congress Government. He served as India's Agent-General in Hyderabad when the Nizam was trying to keep his State independent of the Indian Union. He became a member of the Constituent Assembly in 1948. He was Food and Agriculture Minister of the Government of India in 1950. He was Governor of Uttar Pradesh during 1952-57. He resigned from the Congress and became the Vice President of the newly formed "Swatantra Party" standing for free enterprise. Till his death in 1971 he devoted all his energies to the building up of the Bhavan as the premier cultural organization of the country.

This man was an institution, not only because he founded the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, one of the leading education institutes in the country, but also because of the vastness of his genius. Being a patriot, freedom fighter, scholar, reformer, and educationalist, K. M. Munshi was a colossal figure in public life for the good part of the twentieth century.

Kanaiyalal Maneklal Munshi was born in Broach in south Gujarat. He got his primary education, so to speak, at his mother's knee, his secondary education from Khan Bahadur Dalal High School, Broach, and later he had the privilege of having a stalwart like Sri Aurobindo Gosh for a teacher at Baroda College. Under Sri Aurobindo's influence, he got attracted to armed rebellion against the British, and even learnt to make bombs. But when he moved to Bombay in 1915, he drifted towards the Home Rule Movement, and was later elected member of the Subjects Committee of the Indian National Congress in 1917.

The other influences in his life were Gandhi, Patel, Bhulabhai Desai, and Jinnah. After completing his Law degree from Bombay University, he enrolled himself as advocate in 1913, and soon became a member of the Bar. As his fame spread, he started getting cases from all over India. About this time his first novel was being serialised in a Gujarati weekly.

During World War I, he was influenced by the Home Rule movement. When Sardar Patel was organising the Bardoli Satyagraha, Munshi lent his support, and when Gandhi announced the Salt Satyagraha, he joined the movement along with his wife. He started the movement for a Parliamentary wing of the Congress, and later became Secretary of the Congress Parliamentary Board in 1938. The same year he founded the well-known Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan and Institute of Agriculture at Anand.

Between 1907 and 1915, Munshi strove for the fusion of different sub-castes of the Bhargava Brahmins. In 1912-13, he took part in the activities of the Social Reform Association and championed the cause of widow remarriage. He in fact showed the way by marrying Lilavati, a widow, in 1922. In 1939, he founded the Children's Home for the delinquent children at Chembur, Bombay.

In 1941, Munshi resigned from the Congress, and started the Akhand Hindustan Movement. On Gandhi's advice he rejoined the Congress, and was elected to the Constituent Assembly. Nehru appointed him to the Experts' Committee for drafting the Constitution of India. When the situation in Hyderabad was critical, he lent all his experience as Agent-General to bring it under

control. He was appointed Union Food and Agriculture Minister, and also served as Governor of Uttar Pradesh.

Since Munshi believed in a strong opposition, he along with C. Rajagopalachari, became one of the founders of the Swatantra Party. But he is best remembered for his efforts to promote education in India. He founded the Panchagani Hindu High School in 1924, and the following he took active part in the movement for founding a university in Gujarat. He was also elected a Fellow of the University of Bombay, where he was largely responsible for giving regional languages adequate representation, and was also instrumental in starting the department of Chemical Technology. H. H. the Gaikwad of Baroda nominated him on the Baroda University Commission.

A prolific writer and conscientious journalist, Munshi started a Gujarati monthly called Bhargava, was joint-editor of Young India, and he started the Bhavan's Journal in 1954. Some of his better-known books are: Gujarat and its Literature, Akhand Hindustan, Glory that was Gujardesh, The Ruin that Britain Wrought, The End of an Era, and Shishu ane Sakhi. He was also President of the Sanskrit Viswa Parishad, the Gujarati Sahitya Parishad, and the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan.

After his release from prison in 1924, Gandhi sought to bring back the Swarajists to the Congress and re-unite the party. Gandhi's supporters were in a vast majority in the Congress, and the Congress still remained India's largest political party, but Gandhi felt it necessary to heal the divide with the Swarajists, so as to heal the nation's wounds over the 1922 suspension.

The Swarajists sought more representation in the Congress offices, and an end to the mandatory requirement for Congressmen to spin khadi cloth and do social service as a prerequisite for office. These was opposed by Gandhi's supporters, men like Vallabhbhai Patel, Jawaharlal Nehru and Rajendra Prasad, who became known as the No Changers as opposed to the Swarajist Changers. Gandhi relaxed the rules on spinning and named some Swarajists to important positions in the Congress Party. He also encouraged the Congress to support those Swarajists elected to the councils, so as not to embarass them and leave them rudderless before the British authorities.

When the Simon Commission arrived in India in 1928, millions of Indians were infuriated with the idea of an all-British committee writing proposals for Indian constitutional reforms without any Indian member or consultations with the Indian people. The Congress created a committee to write Indian proposals for constitutional reforms, headed by now Congress President Motilal Nehru. The death of Lala Lajpat Rai, beaten by police in Punjab further infuriated India. People rallied around the Nehru Report and old political divisions and wounds were forgotten, and Vithalbhai Patel and all Swarajist councillors resigned in protest.

Between 1929 and 1931, the Indian National Congress would declare the independence of India and launch the Salt Satyagraha. In this tumultuous period, the Swaraj party dissolved into the Congress.

The Swaraj Party was formed by Indian politicians and members of the Indian National Congress who had opposed Mahatma Gandhi's suspension of all civil resistance in 1922 in response to the Chauri Chaura tragedy, where policemen were killed by a mob of protestors. Gandhi felt responsible for the killings, reproached himself for not emphasizing non-violence more firmly, and feared that the entire Non-Cooperation Movement would degenerate into an orgy of violence between the British-controlled army and police and mobs of freedom-fighters, alienating and hurting millions of common Indians. He went on a fast-unto-death to convince all Indians to stop civil resistance. The Congress and other nationalist groups disavowed all activities of disobedience.

But many Indians felt that the Non-Cooperation Movement should not have been suspended over an isolated incident of violence, and that its astonishing success was actually close to breaking the back of British rule in India. These people became disillusioned with Gandhi's political judgments and instincts.

Kanaiyalal Maneklal Munshi' s versatility and achievements were in a a way unique. he was an eminent lawyer, one of the framers of India's Constitution and a seasoned statesman. Coming under the inspiring influence of Sri Aurobindo during his student days, Munshi became an ardent fighter for India's freedom working at different stages in close association with Jinnah, Tilak, Besant,

mahatma Gandhi, Sardar Patel and Pandit Nehru. His achievements as Home Minister of Bombay in 1937, as India's Agent-General in Hyderabad before the Police Action, as India's Food Minister and as Governor of Uttar Pradesh were characterized by rate courage and decisive energy.

Acknowledged as the foremost writer in Gujarati in his times, his contribution to literature was vast as it was varied, including novels, dramas, memoirs and history in Gujarati, besides several historical and other works in English, notable "Gujarat and its Literature", "Creative Art of Life", "To Badarinath", "Saga of Indian Sculpture", "The End of An Era", "Krishnavatara" and "Tapasvini".

THE FIRST HISTORICAL SESSION OF INDIAN CONSTITUTENT

Assembly commenced on the 9th December 1946, Monday, in the Constitution hall of New- Delhi. Though the Constituent Assembly consisted of 296 members, the first historical session was attended by only 210 members. Attending this session, Mr. K.M. Munshi, a prominent intellectual of the then India, remarked, "A great day for India has dawned. Indians are going to frame their own constitution, but there is unhappiness everywhere." Observing the discouraging political scenario of the country Mr. K.M. Munshi had expressed such views as because the Muslim league had decided not to attend the aforesaid historical session of the Constitutent Assembly. The rulers of different princely states were also not co-operating with the Congress leaders and the British Govt. had no particular message regarding this historical session. The British Prime Minister Mr. Churchil added fuel to the fire by his self-styled views in connection with this historical session that "The Constituent Assembly represented only one major community of India." Mr. Viscount Simon had also expressed his negative remarks by saying that "The Constituent Assembly of India was a body of Hindus.

In fact, the aforesaid views were after all wrong, unjust and politically motivated. Because, the first historical session of Constituent Assembly was attended by the representatives of all castes, communities and religions of India. Amongst the 210 members who attended the first historical session of the Constitutent Assembly, there were 155 high caste Hindus, 30 Schedule Caste representatives, 5 Tribals, 5 Sikhs, 5 Indian Christians, 3 Anglo-Indians, 3 Parsis and 4 Muslim members. Though the Constituent Assembly had 80 Muslim members out of total 296 members their attendance was very poor as because the Muslim League had called upon the Muslim members to boycott the first historical session of constituent Assembly.

The main duty and responsibility of the makers of Indian Constitution was to reflect and represent the hopes, aspirations and dreams of each caste, class and community of the country.

Some people had opposed the method of nomination of members to the Constitutent Assembly and apprended that as the nominated members were not the elected representatives of the common people they would fail to reflect the hopes, aspirations and dreams of Indians while framing the Constitution. Reacting to the aforesaid apprehension of the opposing people, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar remarked "The Constituent Assembly in making a Constitution has no partisan motive.

Beyond securing a good and workable Constitution it has no axe to grind. In considering the articles of the Constitution it has no eye on getting through a particular measure. The future parliament if it met as a Constituent Assembly. Its members will be acting as partisans seeking to carry amendments to the Constitution to facilitate the passing of party measures which they have failed to get through Parliament by reason of some articles of the Constitution which has acted as an obstacle in their way. Parliament have an axe to grind when the Constituent Assembly has none." As per the opinion of Mahatma Gandhi, the Constituent Assembly should reflect and represent the national life of Indians. Gandhi's vision was going to become a reality as because towering personalities like Sarbapalli Dr. Radhakrishnan, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, Mr. K.M. Munshi, Alladi Krishna Swami Ayar, Prof. K.T. Sah, N. Gopalswamy Ayengar and Hrudayanath Kunjur were the members of Indian Constituent Assembly.

The agenda of the first historical session of Indian Constituent Assembly was :-

1. The selection of Interim Chairman.
2. The oath taking ceremony of members.

In the beginning of the Session, Acharya Krupalini proposed the name of Mr. Sachidananda Sinha, a prominent Congress Leader of the country, to adorn the post of interim chairman of Constituent Assembly and after assuming the chairmanship, Mr. Sinha in his inaugural speech stated briefly regarding the Constitution of different Countries of the world and advised the members to study and go deep through the American Constitution. Mr. Sinha further opined that-while framing the constitution, the makers of Constitution must study and observe the socio-economic and political situation of the country in order to meet the needs of all classes of people.

Quoting the noteworthy sayings of famous American jurist Mr. Joseph story, Mr. Sachidanand Sinha addressed the dignitaries present at the first historical session of Indian Constituent Assembly as follows, "Republics are created by virtue of public spirit and intelligence of citizens. They fall, when the wise are banished from the public councils because they dare to be honest and the profilgates are rewarded because they flatter the people, in order to betray them." Reciting some verses of Poet Iqbal and predicting the bright future of India Mr. Sinha concluded his speech quoting the famous stanza from Bible "where there is no vision, the people perish." After the concluding speech of Mr. Sinha, the oath taking ceremony of members was commenced. The secretary of Constitutent Assembly Mr. H.V.R. Ayengar called the names of each member to participate in oath taking ceremony. Each member was going to the secretary when called by name and was returning to his concerned seat after taking the oath and putting his signature on a register.

Before declaring the conclusion of the first historical session of Indian Constituent Assembly Mr. K.M. Munshi, one of the greatest intellectual of India, remarked : "For the moment, the spirit of triumph is in the air, but the smell of coming danger persists. Thus began the first hour of our freedom."

"AT times one has to close his (sic) eyes in national interest." The "senior police officer" who made this confession to The Indian Express, in Srinagar on February 17, provided a truthful explanation for the compromises which sections of the medi a and academia tend to make in the "national interest".

The officer was speaking of the volte-face his chief, A.K. Suri, had performed with regard to the disclosure of the arrest by the police of a man from Military Intelligence, in plain clothes, for firing wantonly on a group of youngsters in Maisuma , in Srinagar. But, let alone matters of immediate occurrence or issues of current interest such as Kashmir and the border dispute with China, even on historical events one finds a practice of economising with truth.

That K.M. Munshi, India's Agent-General in the erstwhile state of Hyderabad, did not mention in his memoirs The End of an Era (1957) the massacre of Muslims in many areas in the wake of the Indian Army's "Police Action" in September 1948 - itself a compromise with the truth - was but to be expected in view of his outlook. Not so its omission in standard works by writers who aspired to scholarly values and who were not communal; only "patriotic" in a perverted but familiar manner. A rare exception was the book by Communist Party of India (Marxist) leader P. Sundarayya, Telengana People's Struggle and its Lessons (1972). He wrote of the "untold miseries" that were inflicted on "the ordinary Muslim people" (pages 88-89).

Suppression of records is not only unethical but futile. More often than not, the foreign scholar will unearth it from archives in London or Washington, or in India itself. A German scholar has done just that. Margrit Pernau records in her book The Pa ssing of Patrimonalism that "while the occupation by the Indian army had been quick and had caused only relatively few casualties, the following communal carnage was all the more terrible. The Razakars had sown wind and reaped not only storm but a hu rricane which in a few days cost the lives of one-tenth to one-fifth of the male Muslim population primarily in the countryside and provincial towers".

Professor Wilfred Cantwell Smith, a scholar on Islam and a critic of Jinnah's politics, wrote a seminal article in the periodical The Middle East Journal in 1950 (Volume 4) titled Hyderabad: A Muslim Tragedy. He was Lecturer in Islamic Hist ory at the University of the Punjab and at the Forman Christian College, Lahore (1940-1946) and visited Hyderabad in 1949. In a critique of the Nizam's policies and of Qasim Razvi, the leader of the

Razakars, he also fairly described the aftermath. "Off the battlefield, however, the Muslim community fell before a massive and brutal blow, the devastation of which left those who did survive reeling in bewildered fear. Thousands upon thousands were slaughtered; many hundreds of thousands uprooted . The instrument of their disaster was, of course, vengeance. Particularly in the Marathwara section of the state, and to a less but still terrible extent in most other areas, the story of the days after 'police action' is grim.

"The only careful report on what happened in this period was made a few months later by investigators - including a Congress Muslim and a sympathetic and admired Hindu - commissioned by the Indian Government to study the situation. The report was submitted but has not been published; presumably it makes unpleasant reading. It is widely held that the figure mentioned therein for the number of Muslims massacred is 50,000. Other estimates by responsible observers run as high as 200,000, and by some of the Muslims themselves still higher. The lowest estimates, even those offered privately by apologists of the military government, came to at least ten times the number of murders with which previously the Razakars were officially accused... In some areas, all the men were stood in a line, and done to death. Of the total Muslim community in Hyderabad, it would seem that somewhere between one in ten and one in five of the adult males may have lost their lives in those few days. In additio n to killing, there was widespread rape, arson, looting, and expropriation. A very large percentage of the entire Muslim population of the Districts fled in destitution to the capital or other cities; and later efforts to repatriate them met with scant s uccess." He was referring to a report by Pandit Sundarlal (1886-1980) and Kazi Muhammad Abdul Ghaffar(1889-1956).

In 1988, Omar Khalidi, a devoted chronicler of Hyderabad, published what he claimed were extracts from their Report in his compilation of essays, Hyderabad: After the Fall (Hyderabad Historical Society; Wichita, Kansas; U.S.). His introduction to the extracts, though informative, is marred by inaccuracies and intemperate language. He had relied, somewhat uncritically, on an interview with Yunus Salim who claimed inaccurately, that he was a member of the team led by Sundarlal which toured Hyderabad in November-December 1948. A 32-year-old State attorney then, he was dismissed from the post for having helped the team.

Yunus Salim was a Deputy Minister for Railways in Indira Gandhi's government (1969) and a Governor of Bihar in 1991. Garbled versions of the Report appeared in Pakistan. Khalidi writes: "In addition to the copy in the Union Home Ministry, Srinivas Lahoti , a Communist Party of India leader in Hyderabad, owned a copy. In an interview in February 1988 he claims to have deposited it with the National Archives of India, New Delhi upon his party's instruction. The present writer obtained fragments of t he Report (which is partly in English and partly in Urdu) from owners who wish to remain anonymous. The portion in English is being reproduced without any alteration. The Urdu portion is translated into English."

Khalidi was misled. The entire document is in English and the "fragments" he reproduces should have put him on notice that it is not safe to rely on them. The brief Introductory portion is intrinsically unreliable. The rest is a village-wise and d istrict-wise account.

Union Home Minister Vallabhbhai Patel reacted angrily to the Report in a letter to Abdul Ghaffar dated January 4, 1949:

"I notice that in your report you mentioned that you were asked by the Government of India to proceed to Hyderabad State on a goodwill mission. At least I am not aware of any such mission having been entrusted to you by the Government of India. As far as I know, you wanted to go there and it was arranged that you should go there at Government expense. There could have been no question of Government of India sending any goodwill mission to Hyderabad State.

"I notice that your report is and your activities were, restricted to making inquiries about what happened during and after the police action. There is nothing in it about the extent and consequences of Razakar atrocities. Probably that was out of the terms of reference which you had set for yourselves. At the same time, you have covered in your reports matters which could by no stretch of imagination, have formed the purview of your enquiry. I should also like to say at once that the detailed in quiries

which have been made by the local administration over a fairly long period as opposed to the roving enquiries which you have made during such a short period show that your estimate and your appreciation of the position lack balance and proportion . Finally you have rushed into a sphere which might have been more appropriately left to be covered by experienced statesmanship and administrative ability."

The assertions were simply untrue and the aspersions were unworthy of Sardar Patel. In those days nobody could have toured the State without official approval. That the team went there admittedly "at government expense" revealed a lot. And, as we know "e xperienced statesmanship and administrative ability" do not guarantee impartiality in inquiries. The report censured the Razakars and was balanced.

Kazi Abdul Ghaffar was a bitter critic of Razvi's Majlis-e Ittihadul-Muslimin and was trusted by the State Congress. He was editor of Firangi Mahal's Khilafatist paper Akhuwat (1919-20) and of Payam (1934-46) and was respected as a scholar-journalist.

He visited Hyderabad in October along with Padmaja Naidu and alerted Maulana Abul Kalam Azad to the happenings there. Pandit Sundarlal was vice-president of the United Provinces Congress (1931-36) and as president of the All-India Peace Counc il (1959-63), urged rapprochement with China against the majority view of the times.

His magnum opus, The Gita and The Quran, is a neglected work. An English translation was published in 1957 by the Institute of Indo-Middle East Cultural Studies, Hyderabad. Neglected also is Volume 8 (second series) of Selected Works of Jawahar lal Nehru (1990) (pages 102-113).

In a Note to Sardar Patel's Ministry of States, dated November 14, 1948, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, while denying Pakistan's propaganda, wrote: "I have recently had talks with Kazi Abdul Ghaffar and Miss Padmaja Naidu, who have just returned from H yderabad.

They are both reliable observers... The impression I have gathered from these talks is that while our army is generally

believed to have functioned well and to have protected the people, there is little doubt that a very large number of outbreaks took place in the small towns and villages resulting in the massacre of possibly some thousands of Muslims by Hindus, as well as a great deal of looting, etc...

This information is contrary to what I had believed and I should like it to be verified through our military and civil authorities in Hyderabad. We must know the truth, or else we shall be caught saying things which are proved to be false later." It is unlikely that those reports did not reach the ears of the Minister concerned, Vallabhbhai Patel.

Even men like Dr. Zakir Hussain's brother, the academic Dr. Yusuf Husain Khan, and Dr. M. A. Ansari's nephew, M.A. Ansari, a High Court Judge, were "removed from their post", Nehru complained.

He added: "One of the persistent charges made is that we inte nd to kill what is called Muslim culture. Hyderabad is known all over the Middle East as a city of Muslim culture. The Osmania University is well known and even better known is the publication department and the translation bureau of the State."

With a letter to V.P. Menon, the secretary of the Ministry, dated November 26, 1946, Nehru enclosed a note on the situation in Hyderabad and remarked: "If possible, some good non-officials should go there to help the administration and to try to produce a better frame of mind both among the Muslims and the Hindus."

The editor to the volume recorded: "A four-man goodwill mission, consisting of Kazi Abdul Ghaffar, Pandit Sundarlal, Moulana Abdulla Misri and Furrukh Sayer Shakeri, was sent to Hyderabad at the personal instance of Nehru to study existing conditions and to help in the establishments of communal harmony.

After a brief visit to Bidar and Osmanabad districts by Major-General Chaudhury, Pandit Sundarlal, Akbar Ali Khan and Fareed Mirza, two teams, one consisting of Pandit Sundarlal, Kazi Abdul Ghaffar, Mul la Abdul Basith and Mohammed Yunus Saleem had toured Bidar, Osmanabad and Nanded while the other consisting of Moulana Abdulla Misri, Furrukh Sayer and Fareed Mirza visited

Aurangabad, Bhir and Gulbarga. They took stock of the information collected and s ent a report to Vallabhbhai Patel."

All of which shows Sardar Patel's repudiation of the officially sponsored team to be less than honest. Nehru's note cited "additional reports from Hyderabad" about the killing and looting. It said: "If there is even a fraction of truth in these reports, then the situation in Hyderabad was much worse than we had been led to believe. It is important that the exact facts should be placed before us.

We want no optimistic account and no suppression of unsavoury episodes. That would lead us to form incorrect judgments... A sense of fear seems to pervade the Muslims of Hyderabad. That is perhaps natural after all that has happened. But unless we can lessen this fear, the situation will become worse."

Dr. Charan Sandhilya, Director of Pandit Sundarlal Institute of Asian Studies at Ghaziabad obtained for this writer a copy of the full text of the Sundarlal Report from the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi (excerpts on facing page). It record s official sponsorship and reflects their objectivity in denouncing the Razakars' murderous attacks on Hindus, in praising officials where praise was due, yet never flinching from telling the terrible truth about the massacre of Muslims. This is a truth which hardly any Indian scholar has deigned to admit this day.

The Sundarlal Report is of more than historical importance; it is of current relevance, for the massacres, coupled with the national indifference to them, have left scars in the minds of Muslims in the State, Hyderabad city in particular. And some Muslim communal parties have not been slow to exploit these scars.

Operation Polo or Police Action refers to the successful Indian military operation which resulted in the integration of the State of Hyderabad and Berar into the Union of India on September 12, 1948.

This was the first large-scale military operation carried out by the independent Indian state.

The military operation was carried out because the State of Hyderabad under Osman Ali Khan, Asif Jah VII, decided to remain independent after the partition of India. Wary of a Muslim ruled state right in the middle of India, Deputy Prime Minister Sardar Patel decided to annex the state of Hyderabad.

Though backed by Qasim Razvi's armed militias, known as Razakars, and a distant moral support of Pakistan, the Hyderabad State Forces were easily defeated by the Armed Forces of India within five days. At that time, Hyderabad state had some 17 polo grounds, largest in India, hence the name Operation Polo.

The Dispute

After the Indian independence in 1947, the country was partitioned on communal lines and Pakistan was carved out as a Muslim nation. The princely states were left free to make whatever arrangement they wished with either India or Pakistan. The Nizam ruled over a cosmopolitan population of over 16 million people, and over lands extending to 82,698 sq.miles of homogeneous territory.

These advantages persuaded the Nizam to attempt an independent existence, when the British withdrew from the sub-continent in 1947. He refused to join either India or Pakistan, preferring to form a separate kingdom within the British Commonwealth of nations.

The proposal for independent state was rejected unambiguously by the British government. The Nizam then resolved upon exploring the possibility of independence.

Towards this end, he kept up open negotiations with the Government of India regarding the modalities of a future relationship while opening covert negotiations with Pakistan on a similar vein. The negotiations with the then Indian Union were conducted through K. M. Munshi who was the diplomatic envoy and trade agent to the princely state of Hyderabad.

He also concurrently encouraged the activities of the Razakars, a militant Muslim organization under the leadership of Qasim Razvi that vehemently opposed any union with the Government of India. The Razakars were active in violently intimidating the

local Hindu population and pledged to maintain the Muslim supremacy in Deccan and Hyderabad State. At the same time, thousands of Muslims flooded into Hyderabad, refugees of Hindu violence. An attempt by some Hindu nationalists to assassinate the Nizam hampered the negotiations being conducted with the Indian Union.

The Nizam repeatedly cited the opinion of the Razakars as evidence that the people of the state were opposed to any agreement with India. This was held by the Government of India to be untenable and disingenuous, and in any case were most eager for Hyderabad to effect a merger with India.

Meanwhile, many peasants of the Hyderabad state revolted against the Nizam under the leadership of Communist Party of India. The Telangana peasant armed struggle was successful in driving out local landlords called Zamindars, and distributing their land to the landless. However, Nizam was able to suppress the armed struggle.

However, majority of his subjects were Hindus and his territory was surrounded on all sides by Indian territory. The resulting violence and exodus of people outside of Hyderabad state prompted the new Indian government to invade and annex Hyderabad under Operation Polo in 1948.

Sequence of the Operation

Finally, the Police Action against Hyderabad was started on Monday, 13th September 1948. There was hardly any resistance from the Hyderabad forces. The Indian forces reached the outskirts of the city four days later.

On the noon of 17th September, a messenger brought a personal note from the Nizam to K.M.Munshi asking him whether he could see the Nizam at 4-00 p.m. He had not granted Munshi an interview since his appointment as India's Agent General ten months ago.

Earlier, the Nizam had spent the morning in hectic consultations. His premier had seen him twice already. The Nizam had summoned him the previous day and asked for his resignation by the morning of the next day. The cabinet decided to resign forthwith.

Resignation of Laik Ali

As soon as Munshi entered the sitting room, a reportedly desolate ruler said: "The vultures have resigned. I don't know what to do". He handed him the letter of resignation of Laik Ali, the Prime Minister. His hands were shaking. He had this problem for some time, which became pronounced, when he was tense or angry.

Munshi had come to know about the resignation earlier from Laik Ali himself. He said that he was worried about the safety of the citizens. He suggested that Commander-in-Chief of Hyderabad State General El Edroos should be asked to take steps to preserve law and order in the city. The Nizam then sent for his commander-in-chief and told him accordingly

Nizam's Broadcast

Munshi also suggested that the Nizam might make a broadcast welcoming the Police Action and withdrawing his complaint to the Security Council. Munshi explained and offered to help draft the speech.

It was the Nizam's first visit to the Radio Station. No red carpet was spread for him; no formalities were observed. No music, no anthem was played before or after the broadcast. The speech was in English. Nobody bothered to translate it into Urdu. After the broadcast the Nizam drove back to King Kothi to brood. Munshi on his way to Bolarum found the streets full of excited crowds shouting national slogans. Munshi was mobbed and had to address groups of people en route.

That night the city changed a great deal. Many khaki uniforms were discarded, many beards shaved. The shouting, rampaging crowds of razakars disappeared magically. The citizens emerged from their cocoons. People of all ages came out in throngs waving the tricolour of India.

The Surrender Ceremony

The surrender ceremony was fixed at 4 p.m.

General Choudhuri spoke gravely: "I have been ordered by Lt. General Maharaj Rajendresinhji, General Officer Commanding-

in-Chief, Southern Command to take the surrender of your army".

"You have it". "You understand that this surrender is unconditional". "Yes, I understand".

Choudhuri smiled and shook hands with Edroos. Then he opened his cigarette case and offered him a cigarette. Edroos proffered a lighter. Choudhuri's team joined them.

The party drove to the residence of India's Agent General. A jubilant crowd cheered the victorious general there. He waved in return and then sat down to discuss the details with Munshi, Edroos and others.

The Aftermath

There were large scale communal riots in various parts of the state in the immediate aftermath of the military operation. The Nizam received the ceremonial post of Rajpramukh in 1950, but resigned from this office when the states were re-organised in 1956 on linguistic basis and large parts of Hyderabad state went to Bombay state. Many officials and members of the royal family fled and re-settled in Pakistan where they now live.

6

Tej Bahadur Sapru

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru was born at Aligarh in 1875. He matriculated from Agra and went on to do his M.A. in English. After getting his law degree, he started his legal practice at Moradabad, finally moving to Allahabad in 1898.He was nominated to the Legislative Assembly in 1913 and appointed to the Viceroy's Executive Council in 1920.He resigned from the Council in 1922. In 1931, he went to attend the Round Table Conference.

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru was considerably influenced by western culture. He was a prominent figure in the social circle at Allahabad and a number of visitors were always to be found at his residence every evening. His professional mantle fell on his sons and grandsons, who followed him into the legal profession.

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru was an eminent lawyer, political and social leader in India during the British Raj. He was knighted in 1922. He was born in a Kashmiri Hindu family. He was educated at the Agra College. Sapru worked in the Allahabad High Court as a lawyer where Purushottam Das Tandon worked as his junior. Sapru was a jurist and leader of the Indian Liberal Party. He favoured a dialogue with the British Empire and sought self-government reforms, but not independence from the Empire.

Sapru and others like M.S. Jayakar favored discussions and dialogue with the British, and were regular participants in the provincial and central legislatures that most Indians thought were rubber-stamps of the Viceroy. He carried forward the moderate policies of Gopal Krishna Gokhale in the radicalized post-Amritsar Massacre period after World War I. Sapru criticized Mahatma

Gandhi's leadership, as well as the Non-Cooperation Movement and the Salt Satyagraha. However, he often acted as a mediator which helped him to broker the Gandhi-Irwin Pact, bringing the Salt Satyagraha to an end; and the Poona Pact, striking an agreement between Gandhi, B.R. Ambedkar and the British government.

However, in the polarized atmosphere of the time, his Liberal Party remained an intellectual talking shop with little popular backing - it was less than the sum of its distinguished leadership. Sapru served in the United Provinces (now Uttar Pradesh) Legislative Council (1913-16), the Imperial Legislative Council (1916-20), and was law member of the Viceroy's Council (1920-23). He was very active in the Indian Round Table Conferences 1931-1933 and served as an informal spokesman for liberal views in the first of these which was boycotted by Congress. He was also a member of the Privy council in 1934. Sapru strongly supported Britain and the inclusion of British India in World War II. However, Sapru was one of the most important lawyers engaged to defend captured soldiers of the Indian National Army, led by Subhas Chandra Bose. Although regarded with respect in independent India, Sapru was very unpopular amongst common people due to his pro-British opposition to the Indian National Congress and leaders like Mahatma Gandhi.

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru played a pivotal role in the development of modern India's constitutional and political life. Born in Aligarh, he practiced law in Moradabad before moving to Allahabad, a city then synonymous with intellectual rigour and scholarship. A staunch Congressman, he attended the 1892 session of the Indian National Congress, was a member of the All India Congress Committee, the General Secretary of the Congress party and also the President of the UP Congress Committee. He was also a member of the UP Legislative Council, and thereafter of the Imperial Legislative Council.

The principal milestones of India's constitutional development and freedom struggle have the stamp of Sir Tej's distinctive contributions, his brilliant legal acumen, and great constitutional ability. Thus, whether it is on the Round Table Conferences or in Cripps Mission or for various attempts at Constitutional Reforms, concepts of our federal structure, and so many other, Sir Tej was always there as a guiding spirit. In 1918, he parted company with INC on grounds of principle. He became one of the founding members of a party that eventually came to be called The National Liberal Federation of India.

From the perspective of the Ministry of External Affairs, his role in the establishment of the Indian Council of World Affairs, in 1943, and thereafter as its first President till his death in 1949 is of great significance; for it is to him that we owe the name of this building, this is also what lies at the initiation of the Annual Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru Lecture.

Permit me to share that soon after Sir Tej's death, it was Late Pandit Nehru who, above all, felt that a lasting memorial in his name was necessary. He donated a personal cheque of Rs.500. That became the seed of a subsequent corpus of funds from which this building, the auditorium, indeed this Sapru House came into existence. There is a moral here of great relevance to our times. Political differences did not then stand in the way of either personal or mutual esteem or relations.

Sir Tej Bahadur, a staunch, life long advocate of Hindu-Muslim unity and of a United India; unable to serve in the Constituent Assembly on grounds of deteriorating health, in June, 1947, with great prescience wrote in reply to a letter: "I am afraid the division of India is not going to be the end of our trouble. I fear that may be the beginning of new trouble which may last for a quarter of a century". These words of great wisdom, then conceived that a quarter century was perhaps far enough. Alas! this 'trouble' of which he spoke so presciently has lasted for over half a century now. And that brings me to the heart of my talk today.

THE EVENT

Why does 11 Sept still so dominate our thinking? Why is it the media preoccupation? It is, of course, in part the horror of visual depiction; the awesome impact of real violence (not feigned or cinematic) in front of our very eyes and all across the globe. Most tellingly this brought home a sense of vulnerability, personal and collective to most humankind. If it is the US today, many asked - then who or what is to come next? For the US this was

a major trauma - social, political and economic. Its land & sea frontiers always regarded as secure were now vulnerable. This event is a dramatic demonstration of the destructive power of terrorist acts.

Terrorism - as an aspect of our current history, also effectively now as an ideology, and also as a new tool in the conduct of international affairs, has redefined dimensions of inter-state dynamics in terms that go beyond existing paradigms of geo-politics, of the post Cold-War determinations, indeed of international Affairs, in almost their entirety. There are issues and aspects that we have not sufficiently addressed.

WHAT DOES TERRORISM REDRAW?

Terrorism dramatically redefines 'conflict' through a rejection of all restraints on means. No Geneva Conventions, no Red Cross or Crescent, no restraint about not targeting the innocents, on the contrary terrorism spreads terror by attacking and targetting principally the innocent. We have known War, Peace and Truce. India has lived with Clandestine War, Proxy War, State-sponsored Terrorism, Cross-border Terrorism - what else not. We have long known how terrorism redefines 'War' itself, its concept of 'Truce' is non-existent, and it has altogether a different concept of what constitutes Peace. Earlier causes of mankind's conflicts: Territorial (boundary) disputes; ideological (the Cold War); conquest, or colonialism all of which often employed retribution as a justifiable means for initiating violent conflict. But terrorism accepts none of this; it redefines political geography, for it accepts no boundary; it is an ideology in itself; it conquers and colonizes the mind through terror. It has thus redrawn the contours of geo-politics.

What is Challenged by Terrorism

I must share with you three lists that I have drawn up on the different dimensions of what is impacted upon or challenged by Terrorism.

The First List

My first list begins with civil society and its certainties. The terror of the random and consequent social uncertainty replaces

a sense of Order within Societies with permanent disorder, as a principle psychological tool. Thus peace is the primary casualty of terrorism, and democracy is the next casualty. Individual liberty and free thought follow straight thereafter. Why? Principally, because terrorism, converts the strengths of freedom and democracy into the major weaknesses. An Act of terror is not unique to the globalised world of the late 20th century. Assassination is as old as recorded history.

What is qualitatively different is this new environment in which terrorism is advocated as an acceptable ideology. There are some other significant aspects: firstly, terrorism is also predicated on exploitation of technology, then of communications, and again of employing the resultant exposure, or the "oxygen of publicity", as Margaret Thatcher had once so pithily put it. Axiomatically, therefore, terrorism is most effective, as a weapon of aggression and of intimidation, when employed against open societies, with a free and open media, an ingrained and non-negotiable right to freedom of expression. Secondly, terrorism exploits the confidentiality of our modern financial and banking systems. Thirdly, spread of terrorism is facilitated by free movement within and between countries.

These aspects are critical to any terrorist assault. Yet, these are the very elements that are the basic building blocks of democratic societies. How ironic that what a democracy considers to be its most valued and cherished strengths, principles, and pillars are seen as its weakest tactical links, on and through which a terrorist assault can be mounted most effectively.

Second List

On my second list, I must begin with concept and application of 'power': both hard, i.e. compelling power; and, soft that is persuasive power. Our past perceptions no longer hold good because terrorism questions both the instruments and the established hierarchies of power. Terrorism is redefining 'power'? It rejects all traditional norms of international order like 'Balance of Power'; 'Spheres of Influence'; even of 'Coalition of Forces'. It works for establishing the hegemony of terror. Terrorism, rejects all established boundaries, treaties, limitations, norms - whether

geographic or moral. Despite these anarchic attributes terrorism can be and is employed as an instrument of State policy.

The ultimate peril of adopting this path are, in the early stages, discounted on the anvil of convenience: because the tool of terrorism is a low cost option - in the short term, but always desirable in the immediate term.

I have often by now repeated the thought that while an individual can declare war on a nation, a nation can simply not declare war on an individual. When I say this I am not making a normative or a moral judgment. This is the objective reality; for terrorist organizations are like cellular structures. They are not like beehives, dependent only on a 'Queen Bee'. Terrorism is not unlike a tissue, a 'system', a 'Qaida'; each cell of which, in a sense, is self-contained and can reproduce itself in identical forms. As it feeds on anarchy, it could, theoretically exist, at least for sometime, without a leader too, and to the extent that we look only for figure-heads, we limit our understanding, our approach and therefore, our capability of confronting a much larger challenge. The central challenge and the task is to deny terrorism a soil in which it can find root, then deprive it of the nutrients and the protective mechanisms that enable it to thrive.

Power

We are not here dealing with a rational balance of power situation in which the risk of instability arises from the existing being upset, leading to war. An act of terror is not a negotiating instrument. It is a statement, a declaration through an assault, existing in a kind of non-territorial space. If this sounds incredible, let us recall that 11th September was not preceded by any demands which could conceivably be negotiated. This would raise the question of our own experiences. For example, the hijackers of IC-814 did present demands. Such examples, apparently establishing the contrary can be multiplied, but as a general proposition my point is that such assaults are not any continuation of "politics by other means", as, for example, a threat of war by one State against another. The terrorist impulse does not interpret politics in terms that democracies do, it aspires to dominate the existing political spectrum by coercion, by any means possible and thus to re-define

politics itself. Let me revert to what I touched upon briefly earlier. Terrorism derives its 'power' and effectiveness from a characteristic that has spread in the last decades of the 20th century. That characteristic is our 'Four Democratizations': of easy access to rapid communications; to technology; to easy travel, and a democratization of access to weapons of destruction. Without any doubt, addiction to and trade in narcotics has fuelled all these monetarily, through the lubricant of electronic and instantaneous transfer of money.

Add to this such demonic innovations as the latest: hijack a civilian aircraft and convert it into an instrument of death by using it as a missile. That is why small groups of individuals, command a power of assault far in excess of any 'political power' they can ever aspire to in any democratic set up; they work towards first destroying order and then replacing it with terror.

To these elements, a further consideration has to be added: Small unrepresentative groups acquire disproportionate power. Yet, precisely because they remain identifiably small, their disproportionate power of destruction is far less responsive to traditional methods. That is also why, perversely, acts of terror acquire the illusion of being weapons of the 'have nots'. It is this, coupled with the 'oxygen of publicity', that gives terrorism a degree of survivability. And that is why unless the very roots, the system - the very 'Qaida' is uprooted from that soil in which it was first permitted to function, we only 'tickle the snake' not destroy it.

It is here that I must share some thoughts about the Taliban. The Taliban was born, during the titanic struggle between the United States of America and the former Soviet Union in which the United States used the establishment and the soil of Pakistan for planting this seed.

There was a mixture of fundamentalism and extremism present from the very moment of its birth. Law and order were seen through altogether different lenses. It became a malevolent, medieval energy which destroyed, to take a recent example, the Bamian Buddhas, and had begun radiating outwards even before it had been taken over by Osama bin Laden. That is why a moderate Taliban is an oxymoron.

What is challenged thereafter, in my third list is the concept of deterrence and the hitherto held central relevance of weapons of mass destruction. The concepts of deterrence presuppose some rationality. On the contrary, terrorism and irrationality are actually synonyms. Terrorism has also challenged dramatically: progress, economic growth and globalisation. We are witnessing not globalisation of economies but rather the globalisation of terrorism. Thus Global Order- political, economic and social - is being challenged by new concepts of anarchy and that is why any flowering of the individual is such anathema, for that confronts the 'colonialism of terror'.

Terrorism is not an acceptable reaction to injustice, real or imaginary, for terrorism aims, through coercive tools, through injustice itself, to establish the "Tyranny of Terror". An argument is often advanced about 'freedom fighters' and terrorists. Freedom can simply not be confused with violence. It is synonymous with stability, with peace and with democracy. Even a rudimentary knowledge of modern Indian history would reveal the lofty ideals that guided our freedom struggle.

In such assertions about Freedom fighters and terrorists, I see a profound confusion between democratic process or what freedom is, indeed the spirit of democracy - and the means of violent terrorist action.

Terrorism has no faith, it is the faith. That is why I must share thoughts about terrorism and Islam. Listen to Bernard Lewis: " Islam has brought comfort and peace of mind to countless millions of men and women. It has given dignity and meaning to drab and impoverished lives. It has taught people of different races to live in brotherhood and people of different creeds to live side by side in reasonable tolerance.

It inspired a great civilization in which others besides Muslims lived creative and useful lives and which, by its achievement, enriched the whole world." And that's why I personally view Terrorism as actually anti-religion. It subscribes to no other. In any event, I hold that: Islam itself is against terrorism. Terrorism is anti-Islamic. Practised in its name it distorts the very face of Islam. Islam is the voice of God, of Allah the all Compassionate, the all

Merciful. This fight against terrorism is the fight of the whole civilized world against an Evil, against an Abomination. How can terrorism be pursued in the name of Islam, or in the sight of Allah?

The USA, after September 11, is, to use Hubert Vedrine phrase - 'a hyperpower' torn between hegemonism and isolationism and this plank of isolationalism has been snatched away, violently, perhaps irretrievably. The very nature of the challenge of terrorism mandates a re-examination of the unilateral. In any answer to the challenge, coordination and interdependence between States is vital for effectively meeting the anarchic cry of global terror. The view of the Peoples Republic of China(PRC) view is that the international community has to seriously address both the problem of terrorism and the consequential issue of cooperation against terrorism. India has welcomed this as also the Chinese invitation that both countries need to engage more purposefully and jointly on terrorism.

The Organisation of Islamic countries(OIC) at its extraordinary session in Doha issued a communiqué containing a strong condemnation of the attacks in the US and calling for exemplary punishment on the perpetrators. To my mind the global change witnessed after September 11 is as profound and as significant as pulling down the Berlin wall.

India's Foreign Policy is global not just a western neighbour policy. Foreign policy is not nostalgia, it is about current realities. That is why it is and can only be a realistic and a balanced policy, based on national interests, with the ability to address challenges thrown up by rapid global transformations. In this particular context, we are witnessing the shift of attention to a new epicenter in Afghanistan but to this I will revert, first another issue.

Let it also be clearly understood that J & K is not a global foreign policy issue. It is an issue that has been made contentious by repeated and persistent interference in India's internal affairs by Pakistan. That is why it is and can only be only a bilateral matter. J&K is not a cause, it is a consequence; of an attitude of perpetual and compulsive hostility; of proxy war, of terrorism being employed as a tool of state policy of which Afghanistan and Pakistan have been the principal training grounds.

India has been pointing to this for at least three years now - that the epicenter of terrorism has shifted to Afghanistan. And it is only appropriate that I address here the many questions that are currently asked, such as: -

(i) Why did India react so early? - I am frankly astonished at this question. How could India react slowly to an issue which is so central not just to its diplomacy, indeed, to our vital national interests.

(ii) Why support this effort? - This is in itself a peculiar question also, since when we acknowledge that there is a problem of global terrorism, how else do we then address it except in totality. We have to stand shoulder to shoulder with the international community on this issue and in this case the United States with whom we have had a JWG on Terrorism for the past two years now.

(iii) Non-Alignment and Terrorism - Many non-aligned countries are victims of the terrorism and, of course, we are in touch with South Africa, who is currently the Chairman of the NAM.

(iv) US interests are limited to Al-Qaida and Osama Bin Laden only? - India's struggle against terrorism did not start on September 11. Our position on Afghanistan is also clear that we stand for a social order and Constitution which would permit in Afghanistan all ethnic groups and communities to address their aspirations.

(v) US-Pak equation versus India - If the USA , today, for tactical reasons, chooses to have an arrangement with Pakistan in which Pakistan sheds the powers of terrorism and that gives to Pakistan a certain degree of economic and other assistance - good luck to Pakistan. I hope that people of Pakistan and rulers of Pakistan would not repeat the mistakes of the past.

(vi) India's US policy undermined? - As a member of the Government, I don't see how it is undermined. Do not under estimate the great strengths of India.

There is another reason, we must reflect on with respect to the developments in our region. Energy security is a part of India's

Foreign policy. In the region, between the Gulf and the Central Asian Republics, the Gulf accounts form 40 to 45 percent of oil reserves and Central Asia 20 percent. Here we are talking of a conflict situation in which more than 50 percent of global energy is located and, therefore, developments there cannot but be central to our concerns.

What about Post-conflict Afghanistan? It is an error to sectionalize Afghanistan. We must hope to restore order and reconstruct the physical and social infrastructure of Afghanistan. We will continue with our efforts for lasting peace. The men, women and children of Afghanistan must be able to lead normal lives and must have access to the facilities of today's world-education, medicine, transport and reasonable conditions of living.

So let me conclude - the soundest strategy, that we can pursue today, consists of perseverance, of patience, of resolve and will, of reinvigorating the moral culture of the free world and about being clear about the true nature of the challenge of terrorism that civilized world faces.

Sapru was appointed a member of the governor general's executive council and served on the Round Table Conferences in London and on the Joint Parliamentary Committee. As a liberal favoring moderate change within the constitutional and legal framework, Sapru worked untiringly in the role of mediator between the British authority and Indian nationalists and between Hindu and Moslem leaders. He sought, for example, to mediate between the Congress and the British in the Round Table Conferences but was unable to exact concessions from either side. In other instances he was successful, as with the Gandhi-Irwin Pact in 1931. He objected equally to Congress tactics of civil disobedience as prejudicial to compromise and to government imprisonment of Congress leaders.

Most notably he was chairman of the Sapru Committee, appointed in November 1944 by the Standing Committee of the Non-party Conference. The committee was charged with examining the whole communal question in a judicial framework following the breakdown of the Gandhi-Jinnah talks on communal problems. Sir Tej selected 29 committee members representative of all communal groups. The committee submitted proposals to

the viceroy, Lord Wavell, in an attempt to break the political deadlock ensuing on the collapse of the Gandhi-Jinnah talks.

The committee's report contained a detailed historical analysis of proposals and claims of each community and a rationale for its constitutional recommendations. On the critical question of partition, the Sapru Committee made a final but fruitless plea to avert the creation of Pakistan. Sapru was also a member of the defense committee in the 1945 trials of Indian National Army officers for treason. The defenses argued that as the INA was an independent army representing an independent government-in-exile, its officers could not be prosecuted for treason.

Throughout the constitutional debates Sapru played a key moderating role, appealing at each stage to Hindu and Moslem and to Englishman and Hindu to conciliate their differences. He sought in the process to safeguard the rights of each communal group.

In early forties, at an all-India gathering of Urdu scholars, the delegates were asked to draw a panel of names of people, who wrote correct idiomatic Urdu. Surprisingly, the panel which consisted of four names, included three Kashmiri Pandits. The panel consisted of Maulvi Abdul Huq, of the Anjuman-i-Tarqi-i-Urdu, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Raja Narendra Nath and Pandit Brij Mohan Datatriya 'Kaifi'. That was the measure of proficiency achieved by the Kashmiri Brahmins in Urdu language.

When Islam was introduced in Kashmir in early fourteenth century, Persian became the court language. The Kashmiri Brahmin, with a remarkable flair for adjusting himself to the changed scenario, switched over from Sanskrit to Persian. The speed with which Kashmiris mastered this foreign language was extraordinary. Overnight, the court circulars, the firmans and the judicial pronouncements were written in chaste Persian by Kashmiri Brahmins with the same ease with which they wrote Sanskrit.

But Kashmiris not only mastered the art of the official language, they also tried their hand at literary forms, notably poetry. Scores of local poets sprang overnight, but their literary output never won any recognition outside the valley. The only exception was

Ghani, whose fame transcended India and reached Iran. Even today Ghani is regarded as a greater Persian poet in Iran than Iqbal. Kashmiri Brahmins, continuing the tradition of Kalhana, wrote history of Kashmir in Persian. They are Anand Kaul Ajaz and Birbal Kachroo, whose Persian chronicles are a valuable source of Kashmir history.

When the Mughul empire decayed, Urdu was born in the ovilight of the decadent Mughul culture. It was in Urdu that the literary genius of Kashmiris flowered and attained heights never before achieved in Persian.

Kashmiris, who migrated to India in the wake of Pathan repression, made Urdu their mother-tongue and soon forgot Kashmiri. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru once proudly declared: "Urdu is my mother-tongue and I am proud of it". Almost every town in India had minor Kashmiri poets, especially in Indian States where they enjoyed royal patronage.

The four Kashmiris who have earned for themselves a niche in the history of Urdu literature are Mohammad Iqbal, Ratan Nath Dhar 'Sarshar' Daya Shankar Kaul 'Nasim', and Brij Narain 'Chakbast'.

There can be no two opinions that Iqbal is one of the greatest Urdu poets of all time. His forefather came from Kulgam from the family of Saprus. Iqbal was proud of being a Kashmiri.

The first and foremost Kashmiri to win recognition as a literary giant in Urdu was Pandit Daya Shankar Kaul 'Nasim' of Lucknow. He was born in Lucknow in 1811 and died in 1845 at the young age of 34. He was a disciple of the great Urdu poet, 'Atish Nasim's 'Gul Bakawali', a versified version of the famed love story, made him immortal. His fame caused envy to many Urdu novelists. Sharar came out with a fantastic story that Nasim was not the real author of the book, but Atish, but Chakbast wrote a spirited defence of Nasim and silenced Sharar and his supporters. This controversy, which has now been settled once for all, was an event of great literary battle in the early part of this century.

Ratan Nath Dhar was the celebrated author Fasana Azad, which is regarded as the forerunner of the Urdu novel. He died in Hyderabad in 1904 under mysterious circumstances. The story

of his coming to literary prominence is as fascinating as his works. He was a school teacher and wrote a piece for the famous Urdu paper Oudh Punch. The editor at once realized the potential of the writer and invited him to write regularly for his paper. Ratan Nath, with prosperity coming to him, became an alcoholic. According to tradition he was paid not in cash but in bottles of whisky for each piece. The messenger of Oudh Punch used to come to him with a bottle of whisky and Ratan Nath Dhar used to write while sipping pegs. He wrote four volumes of Fasana Azad, and the amount of alcohol he must have consumed is anybody's guess. His mastery of the Urdu idiom and dialogues of butlers, begums and courtiers is remarkable for its authenticity. His humour anti wit is there for all to see. His characters are as well drawn as of Dickens and Fasana Azad is akin to Pickwick Papers.

The last great Kashmiri poet was Brij Narain Chakbast, who died at the young age of 44, in 1926. His poetry is full of patriotic fervour, and is devoid of love and romance. Chakbast was an ascetic and a liberal in politics like Sir Tej. But Chakbast was master of diction, idioms and the classical Luknavi Urdu.

In our own day Pandit Anand Narain Mulla, a former judge of the Allahabad High Court and an M.P., is a poet of standing.

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru's services to the cause of Urdu literature are too well known. Raja Sir Kishen Prasad Kaul, of the erstwhile State of Hyderabad, was a great patron of the Urdu poets. Among the lesser known poets one can mention Amar Nath Madan 'Sahir' and Tribhuvan Nath 'Hijar'.

In the valley itself, Kashmiris have served the cause of Urdu literature well. Nand Lal Kaul Talib, Dina Nath Mast and Nand Lal 'Begarz' are well known names, among many.

Those celebrated lines from the author of the 'Prologue to Canterbury Tales' have always appeared to me to contain, as it were, the quintessence of the personality and character of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru-his wisdom, ability, moral greatness, in short, his over-all perfection. Sir Tej stands unique and almost unparalleled in the legal history of India. As his great contemporary Doctor Kailas Nath Katju, himself a stalwart, who has achieved fame in

the triple spheres of law, politics and administration, aptly remarked, "The Allahabad Bar does not still realise the immensity of its obligations to the personality of Dr. Sapru.

Not only numerous beginners have sat at his feet, but his chamber has been the nursery of Judges. He is the soul of honour, and his uprightness of conduct and his professional rectitude have been a beacon light to lawyers throughout the United Provinces all these years." Paying tribute to his extraordinary natural gifts Rt. Hon'ble Srinivas Satri in his inimitable style observed, "Nature fashioned Sapru in one of her lavish moods. She put into his blood several elements of greatness-generous susceptibilities, scorn of meanness, large ideas, command of men." But for all his great and exceptional qualities he was not wholly without his share of foibles, some glaring weaknesses such as changeableness, love of flattery, pronounced moodiness'. Perhaps that is what made him more interesting, lively and intensely human. His intellect too had marked merits and demerits. It dwelt easily among large ideas and fundamentals, and could acquire and impart with zest. But minutiae could escape his mind, and he was capable of great inaccuracies and inconsistencies.

This only served to reveal to the truly discerning admirer the more amiable and human traits of a titanic figure, which was essentially cast in the heroic mould, and which came like a mighty Colossus, bestriding over narrow world.

The finest flower of the Victorian era-unjustly criticised by carping critics for its "cold' priggishness and smug self-complacency"-Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru retained throughout his life the typical characteristics of its culture and outlook on life. He was born at Aligarh in 1875, when Queen Victoria had been for thirtyeight years on the throne of England, and only two years since in 1877 she assumed the title of the Empress of India-which marked the beginning of the train of events which was to culminate in the hey-day of British imperialism in this country. Descended from an aristrocratic family of Dewans, Sapru naturally grew up in a background of Muslim culture and language which had been pampered by foreign rulers and an appreciation of the British political and legal system, and its institutions in general. From his infancy he showed signs of uncommon intellectual ability and

had to his credit an extremely brilliant academic career. He took his M.A. degree from the Agra College, Agra in English in the first division, securing the first position in order of merit. In 1898 he joined the Allahabad High Court Bar. In 1902 he earned the degree of Doctor of Laws and in 1906 was enrolled as an Advocate of the High Court.

He passed through a comparatively short period of waiting and brieflessness. Within about five years of his joining the Bar he got the opportunity of opposing India's top-most lawyer of the time, viz. Sir Rash Behari Ghosh. The case involved principles of Hindu Law and he argued it so brilliantly that in a day he found his feet in the profession. He had crossed the Rubicon, and then he began to climb the heights which his genius entitled him to. His fame spread all over India when he fought successfully a Taluka case in Oudh Chief Court and a Waqf case in Allahabad High Court. From all parts of the country statesmen, business magnates, members of the landed aristocracy and rulers of native States came to seek his legal advice. He conducted with remarkable skill a large number of big Taluka cases. He also appeared as the defence counsel in the enquiries against the Maharaja of Patiala, the Maharaja of Nabha and the Maharaja of Rewa. His deep knowledge of constitutional law was reflected in his vigorous advocacy in the case involving the boundary dispute between the State of Cochin and the Government of India. In 1920 he was appointed the Law Member of the Government of India in recognition of his scholarship in the domain of constitutional law. During his meteoric career in the profession for about half a century he was thrice offered Judgeship of the High Court, but he respectfully declined to accept the same.

Although he was pre-eminently a civil lawyer, his talents were versatile and he appeared in numerous outstanding criminal cases of the day. His argument on the question of corpus delicti and the evidence as to the disposal of the dead body in the B.B. Singh case, in which an I.C.S. Officer was charged with having committed the murder of a maid servant, though repelled by the Courts in India, was ultimately accepted by the Privy Council (1946 P.C. 38). His vast learning had enabled him to rely upon the ratio of two ancient and virtually obscure Irish decisions,

which was endorsed by the Privy Council and a finding of acquittal was recorded.

By his fearless and powerful advocacy Sir Tej Bahadur became the doughty champion of all the forces of independence and defiance of arbitrary authority. He valiantly defended a veteran criminal lawyer of the Allahabad High Court, viz. Shri Kapil Deo Malaviya when notice for the offence of contempt of court was issued to him (see 1935 Allahabad Law Journal Reports, p. 125), because he was the author of an article published in the 'Leader' newspaper, edited by C.Y. Chintamani, in which he had made the general aspersion "In this connection it is amusing to note that when a comparatively undeserving lawyer is raised to the Bench, which is a fairly frequent occurrence .in our judicial history, it is generally claimed etc."

Another sensational case which he argued at the request of the leaders of the Calcutta High Court Bar was the one in which Sri Tushar Kanti Ghosh, the editor of the 'Amrit Bazar Patrika' had been hauled up for contempt of court. [See 1935 Calcutta, 419 (D.B.)]. Yet another matter which echoed throughout India was the 'Search Light' Contempt Case in which in a fit of righteous indignation Sir Tej hurled at the Bench a remark which has become classical, "My Lords, there is no such presumption in law that a Judge knows law".

His forensic style was sober, terse and matter-of-fact. He was not eloquent in the popular sense. He lacked fire, but he was lucid and to the point. He never would indulge in the advocate's tricks. His advocacy was sincere, upright and able. He never regarded 'suppressio veri' and 'suggestio falsi' as legitimate methods of advocacy. He was a great believer in the lofty traditions of the Bar, and no one has maintained a higher standard of professional ethics.

The same rational attitude, free from rhetoric, characterised the style of his speeches on the platform, outside the law courts. In this he differed sharply from other public speakers of the day. He was a debater rather than an orator, and was loath -to sway the multitudes by emotional appeals. There was the greatest contrast between the flamboyant oratory of such leaders of Bengal as Bipin Chandra Pal and the clear cut, incisive, English speech

fastidiously accurate, of Tej Bahadur Sapru in a select gathering of intellectuals at Allahabad.

Dr Sapru made remarkable contribution by his work on the Imperial Legislative Council during the latter part of the first Great War. After returning from the Viceroy's Council he did very valuable work on the Reforms Committee. From 1929 to 1934 he undertook several journeys to England to take party in the deliberations of the Round Table Conferences and the Joint Parliamentary Committee. The Government of India Act of 1935 was, as it were, his god-child, and it formed the nucleus of our present Constitution.

The climax of his legal career came in 1934 when he was made Privy Councillor. In deference to his international reputation as a jurist and lawyer the Oxford University conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Civil Laws.

In political predilections he was a rigid constitutionalist, nurtured on the writings of John Stuart Mill, Edmund Burke, Gladstone and Morley. He belonged to the old school of Indian Liberals, who believed in the efficacy of constitutional methods for making political progress. For several decades he symbolised the golden mean in Indian politics. He was often a successful mediator between warring groups and brought about the Gandhi-Irwin pact. It is not often realised that he was a nationalist to the core through not of the type of the violent arid blustering extremist nationalists of a later generation. Posterity can never forget his indignant challenge to General Smuts, who had refused to allow any citizenship to Indians domiciled in South Africa. "We claim along with you", declared Sapru, "equal citizenship in the same Empire. We are not willing to be relegated from King George's dining hall to King George's stables" Seldom has the case for equal citizenship been put with greater force than that.

Besides being an erudite and an asute stateman, Dr. Sapru was a great gentleman. His conversation was full of anecdotes, which had a touch of humorous exaggeration, but were utterly devoid of malice. He loved to speak of the great ones of the land, of the lions of the law, of striking things said and done in his time, but when he narrated them with evident gusto, one half suspected that they were not nearly so Homeric as he made them out. He had the income of a prince but he also gave and spent like a prince, saving almost nothing.

He possessed a robust constitution and a phenomenal digestion. Doctors had a puzzle in him, for he took absolutely no exercise, slept soundly, smoked incessantly, and ate three, square meals a day, could not do without meat even once, and 'loved chillies as few Andhras do. Although of an ascetic temperament in his attitude towards women, he was an Epicurean in diet and loved rich and delicious food.

After relinquishing his office as a Law Member he brought with him a Goanese cook and chief, and he also employed Muslim cooks. Thus, there used to be three different varieties of food in his kitchen-the Kashmiri, the Muslim and the European. He was a splendid host and entertained sumptuously. He also dressed immaculately and went in for the most expensive garments.

It is difficult to find a person of such wide culture, catholic taste and urbanity. Apart from legal studies, he was vastly read in history, philosophy, political science and literature. He was a great scholar of Urdu and Persian, and Urdu poetry was one of his 'pet affections', to use that phrase of Frederick Harrison. Under his patronage were held in Allahabad - and alas! they have since ceased - the most magnificent 'Mushairas' in which the leading poets of the land participated and which have become landmarks in the cultural history of the town.

He wrote a most illuminating preface to the poetry of Pt. Brij Narain 'Chakbast', which also revealed his great insight into Urdu literature. It is perhaps not known to many that he was chosen by the late Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad as the only person competent to contribute in chaste, felicitous and faultless Urdu a foreword to the collection of Essays written by the Maulana. There is a story told of an amusing incident which happened in Hyderabad when Dr. Tej Bahadur Sapru went to argue a case in which he was pitted against Mohd. Ali Jinnah.

There was an original document in Persian which had to be deciphered and the counsel of the parties were requested to read it out for the benefit of the court. Mr. Jinnah miserably failed and betrayed his profound ignorance of Persian, whereas Mr. Sapru

fluently read out the entire document. This created a sensation and the next morning's newspapers commented in flaming headlines on 'Pandit Jinnah and Moulvi Sapru'.

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru breathed an atmosphere of opulence and magnanimity. There was a grandeur about him, which seemed to scoff at anything which savoured of pettiness or triviality. Such was the effect of his dominating personality that when he entered the scene no one else seemed to exist. His evening 'darbars' have become legendary, where the 'elite' of the town used to be present,exchanging repartees, delightful anecdotes, choicest Urdu and Persian poetry and comments on current, political and social topics. One finds in an immortal letter of the Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri a picturesque description of such 'darbars'. Adverting to Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru he wrote, "His evenings he enjoys most, lounging in loose night apparel, imbibing tobacco in every form except as snuff, and surrounded by cronies who lay it on, as Disraeli did to Victoria, with a trowel".

Sapru's famous house, 19 Albert Road, Allahabad-in whose glorious contiguity the author of this article has the privilege to reside-became a place of pilgrimage for all foreign visitors as well as celebrities of this country. Round him gathered princes and plebians, lawyers and judges, professors and politicians, scientists and men of letters and a myriad satellites that circled round and took warmth from that radiant luminary, until envious death quenched his fire on the 20th January, 1949. He passed away after a full, active and singularly versatile life. Where shall we see the like of him again - such, a virile and magnetic personality, of such moral grandeur and integrity, so anxious to preserve the purity and prestige of the profession, so "learned and lovable, the acme of honour and the pink of courtesy".

He joined the moderate section of the Congress in 1907 and was associated with the newspaper, The Leader. He was one of the signatories of the Memorandum of the 19. A member of the Viceroy.s Imperial Legislative Council, he joined the Home Rule movement of Annie Besant. Appointed Law Member of Lord Reading.s Executive Council, he served for just two years. He seriously objected to the control of the British Secretary of State on Indian affairs, arguing that it would nullify all reform. He

played an important role in the Round Table Conference of 1930. He opposed the Quit India Movement which he felt was a political blunder.

Proceedings of the Meeting of the Boards

It is a great pleasure and privilege to me, Ladies and Gentlemen, to welcome you to Delhi this morning. Indeed, I do not use the language of exaggeration when I say that I regard the inauguration of your proceedings today as the proudest event of my tenure of my present office.

This feeling is due to your eminence and representative character, and to the pre-eminence, amongst the national problems of the day, of the problem to the solution of which the Board is immediately called upon to set its hand. Your distinction, Ladies and Gentlemen, and claim to speak for the various interests that you represent, needs no testimony from me; it must be of nation-wide acceptance. Not only educational achievement but achievements of rare quality in every sphere of activity are represented by you.

We have on the Board Hon'ble Ministers who, in their respective provinces, direct educational policy; ladies like Rajkumari Amrit Kaur and Lady Grigg, whose close touch with public activities relating to the women of India should enable them to give valuable advice about the educational needs of Indian womanhood; a great lawyer, Sir Tej Sapru, a great administrator, Sir Akbar Hydari, whose absence owing to indisposition we all deplore, a great humanist, B. Bhagwan Das, who have taken a life-long and fruitful interest in educational problems. I need not particularise further. To be associated with you all is therefore a matter of pride to one whose sole claim to be in your midst is good fortune. The vital importance to India of educational reconstruction, which is the subject that, in my opinion, demands your attention first, has roused such widespread interest, evoked such wealth of comment in recent years that no words of mine are needed to give it added significance or emphasis. Education goes to the very root of individual contentment and national prosperity; neglect it, and there will be neither national prosperity nor individual contentment. Indeed, their opposites will prevail.

"A very dear and distinguished friend, who will remain nameless, told me the ,other day that the Board had been criticised as the superfluous revival of the lifeless piece of machinery; a body without executive power, and, therefore, without utility. To the extent that this criticism alludes to the educational autonomy of the provinces and states it is true, but nothing new or disheartening. None of us would, even if we could, centralise educational initiative or control; one might as well attempt an educational Pan-Europa, and with equal prospects of success. Not only is centralisation politically unthinkable on the eve of Provincial Autonomy; the size and population of the various provinces make it administratively impracticable. But the charge of lifelessness could only have been made by people ignorant of the motive power of ideas.

The main function of the Board is to test and sift and cohere the current educational thoughts of the day and to impart to what may result from such creative effort the lasting impulse of a progressive policy. It is because we aimed at ensuring the fruition of advice into action that we have invited Hon'ble Ministers in charge of Education in the provinces to sit on the Board. It is because we aimed at viewing the whole field of education in one conspectus that apart from Hon'ble Ministers of Education and their Directors of Public Instruction, we have invited the Inter-University Board to send us three representatives. It is because we want our effort to be quickened and influenced by responsible political opinion that we have with us representatives of the Legislature. If we fail in making the Board useful, Ladies and Gentlemen, it will be either because the advice we give is unsound or the springs of action in the provinces fail to move. Either may happen, but it is a singularly barren form of pessimism to make that possibility the basis of a condemnation of the Board in advance. Destructive perfection is not difficult of attainment; constructive effort, however, imperfect, is frequently of greater value. The alternative to the Board is uncoordinated activity, fitful effort, overlapping, error, avoidable waste. No patriotic Indian could desire this.

"The list of business that Sir George Anderson has circulated has been deliberately kept short. We were anxious to keep the

agenda light, so that the Board could give full attention to the subjects that have been included. Outstanding among these is the relation of unemployment to education. We have, fortunately, amongst us here today persons who have made a special study of the problem. I refer, in particular, to Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, whose readiness to serve on the Board, in spite of the many demands on his time, is only another manifestation of proved devotion to public service.

With their help, gentlemen, it should be possible, at any rate, to make final diagnosis of the disease and to suggest the broad line or lines of treatment. I have no wish to limit the discussion in any way, but I would suggest that we do not spend much time in disputing whether the disease exists. The symptoms crowd in on any observer with poignant insistence. 'Educated' young men are unemployed; many of them show an invincible disinclination for any work other than the drudgeries of literacy, a pathetic incapacity for even moderate proficiency in that mechanical pursuit, a tragic lack of aptitude for anything else. No exceptional perspicacity is needed to discern that this evil must largely result from the system of education that produces them, and the sense of social values that tolerates the system. To change that false or mistaken sense of values is the task of the social reformer and the publicist, but the educationist must not be afraid to mend the system to the extent that he can. I suggest that we approach our task today in that spirit."

Agenda:-The Board was invited to consider the following agenda:-

1. Unemployment and Educational Reconstruction
2. Procedure
3. International Intellectual Cooperation :-

   The formation of a National Committee on Intellectual Cooperation in India; and'
4. Relations of the Central Advisory Board of Education with the Inter-University Board, India.

Proceedings:-The Board considered the above agenda and made the following recommendations :-

(i) Unemployment and Educational Reconstruction

(1) While conscious of the great debt which is due to the education hitherto provided in India and of the part played by universities in promoting higher study and research and in training men and women for the service of India, the Board is of opinion that the following considerations, among others, necessitate a new attitude towards educational problems :-

(a) the increasing desire among educationists and others to bring about changes in the educational system in view of the altered conditions of life;

(b) the growing volume of unemployment among the educated classes;

(c) the emphasis laid on a purely literary form of instruction in schools;

(d) the inadvisability of too frequent examinations;

(e) the large number of 'over-age' pupils in the senior classes of high schools;

(f) the increasing number of. students in universities, who are unable to benefit by university instruction and, in consequence, the difficulty in making satisfactory provision for the better qualified students and for research;

(g) the need of developing training of a more practical type than at present and of making provision for such training, especially for those with little or no literary bent, and of adjusting it to the scheme of general education; and,

(h) the advisability of developing a suitable scheme of rural education, by which boys and girls in rural areas shall be given such training as would develop in them a capacity and desire for the work of rural reconstruction.

(2) The Board is of opinion that a radical readjustment of the present system for professional and university courses, but also to enable them, at the completion appropriate stages, to be diverted to occupations or to separate vocational institutions.

(3) These stages should be :-

(a) The primary stage, which should aim at providing at least a minimum of general education and training and will ensure permanent literacy.

(b) The lower secondary stage, which will provide a self-contained course of general education and will constitute a suitable foundation either for higher education or for specialised practical courses.

In rural areas, the courses at this stage should be attuned to rural requirements.

Some form of manual training at this stage should be provided, which would aim at the development of practical aptitudes and be made compulsory.

(c) The higher secondary stage, in which would be included institutions with varying length of courses- (i) preparing students for admission to universities in arts and science; (ii) for the training of teachers in rural areas; (iii) for agricultural training; (iv) for clerical training; and (v) for training in selected technical subjects which should be chosen in consultation with employers.

Where separate institutions are not possible for the diversified courses, some of them might be incorporated in a higher secondary course of enlarged scope which would permit a choice of alternative groups of subjects and would end in leaving certificates.

(4) At the end of the lower secondary school course there should be the first public examination.

(5) Candidates desirous of joining the subordinate clerical services of government and of local bodies should pass such qualifying examinations as might be prescribed by proper authority and should, not be more than 19 years of age at the date of their examination.

The certificates granted to pupils completing other specialised courses should receive government recognition.

(6) Expert advice would be of value in organising the scheme of reconstruction outlined above; and also for suggesting methods of training masters who would assist pupils and parents in the selection, by the pupils, of courses of study with due regard to their aptitudes.

(7) Each province should organise Employment Bureaux for the purpose of advising students and of eliciting support and guidance of employers interested in the problem.

(8) Every local government should actively explore the possibility of finding new avenues of employment and occupation.

(ii) Procedure

(9) The Board accepts the suggestions contained in the explanatory memorandum on "Procedure" with the following modification under item (ii) (e) on page 2 of that memorandum that "the proceedings of the discussions of the Board will not ordinarily be forwarded to the local governments unless the Board specifically desires otherwise in any particular case."

(iii) Committees

(10) The following members shall form the nucleus of the Standing Committees on the subjects noted against each group:-

1. Lady Grigg
2. Rajkumari Amrit Kaur} Women's Education
3. Dr. A. H. Mackenzie
4. Hon'ble Khan Bahadur M. Aziz-ul-Haque

1. Hon'ble Mr. S. Abdul Aziz
2. Mr. Shyamaprasad Mookerjee} Secondary Education
3. Mr. H. F. Saunders
4. Mr. W. Grieve
5. Hon'ble Mr. B. G. Khaparde

1. Mr. J. E. Parkinson
2. Hon'ble Sir J. P. Srivastava
3. Rajkumari Amrit Kaur} Vernacular Education
4. Sir S. Radhakrishnan
5. The Bishop of Lahore

1. Rt. Hon'ble Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru
2. Dr Zia-ud-Din Ahmad Vocational and Prof-
3. Hon'ble Sir J. P. Srivastava } ssional Education
4. Mr. Shyamaprasad Mookerjee
5. Sir K. Ramunni Menon

The Educational Commissioner with the Government of India shall be a member of all these committees.

The committees shall have power to co-opt members who would be likely to provide local experience and guidance.

(iv) Revival of the Bureau of Education in India

(11) The Bureau of Education should be revived under the control of the Educational Commissioner with the Government of India for dealing specifically with the collection and dissemination of literature relating to educational problems in the various provinces.

(v) International Intellectual Cooperation

(12) The two propositions-

(i) whether the existing arrangement whereby the Educational Commissioner with the Government of India acts as Correspondent with the Secretariat of the International Committee of the League and with the Director of the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation at Paris should continue or whether any steps should be taken for the formation of a proper National Committee on Intellectual Cooperation in India; and

(ii) whether the Inter-University Board, India, or the Central Advisory Board of Education should act as the National Centre of Educational Information for India; should first be referred to the Inter-University Board, India.

(vi) Relations of the Central Advisory Board of Education with the Inter-University Board, India

(13) The Inter-University Board should function automatically and invariably as a consultative body for all purposes relating to university education. The Central Advisory Board of Education, however, will be free to express its independent opinion on any recommendation which the Inter-University Board may make on any question which may be referred to that body for opinion.

The proceedings ended with a vote of thanks to the Chairman and the Educational Commissioner with the Government of India. At the close of the meeting, the Chairman informed the members that, with their permission, a press communique would be issued embodying a brief substance of the proceedings of the Board and requested them to treat all the papers relating to the meeting, which had been circulated to them, as confidential.

"I WOULD have considered myself fortunate indeed if during my tenure of my present office, I could have established a convention that my duty here would be to recount however inadequately your noteworthy attainments, for thereby I might have succeeded in diverting your attention from the somewhat glaring contrast between the signal mediocrity of your ex-officio, Chairman and the rare distinction of the company which he is proud to welcome today.

We have on this Board no less than three Members of the Privy Council-the Right Hon'ble Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru whom we are very glad to see here today, the parent of a famous report which has set us all a thinking, the Right Hon'ble Sir Akbar Hydari, who, I am sorry to say, is unable to attend owing to illness and the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri who is away in Malaya on an important mission.

There are others who have won renown in other walks of life. To this distinguished band, I should like to welcome one no less distinguished, Mr. Jayakar, scholar and man of affairs. I should also like to extend a friendly greeting to Mr. Clow who has devoted his great abilities to industrial problems and to bettering the conditions of Indian labour in factories. I am sure that his

penetrating and cultured mind will be of great benefit to us in considering our problems especially in linking up the system of education to industrial needs. I am also glad to see and welcome a businessman of the ability and sagacity of Lala Shri Ram. I also would like to welcome Mr. Roberts of Bird & Co., who is not here today. I am glad that the Inter-University Board has selected as its representative the distinguished Vice-Chancellor of the Bombay University, Mr. N. V. Chandavarkar in place of Sir Radha-krishnan who has attained the unique distinction of being appointed a Professor at Oxford. I need not particularise further.

"Ladies and gentlemen, since we last met, we have suffered grievous loss by the death of Dr. Mackenzie, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor of Osmania University. I had the privilege of working for a number of years with Dr. Mackenzie in the United Provinces and it is a matter of the deepest regret to me that we shall no longer have the advantage of his advice and assistance. India owes a deep debt of gratitude to the late Dr. Mackenzie for his signal services to the advancement of education in many fields. I am sure that the Board would like to record by a formal resolution their deep sense of loss at the death of a distinguished colleague.

"A Board composed of so many distinguished men and women cannot but make a valuable contribution to one of the most vexed problems of the day, namely, educational reform. No subject lends itself to such divergent views, in none is there more scope for challenging the motives that underlie policy. While many may be prepared to agree to the necessity of reform, concrete proposals are the signal for suspicion, alarm and indignation. It is somewhat curious how slow- footed is educational reform in India. We have had numerous commissions and committees of great weight and authority.

They have after an exhaustive survey of the whole field made their reports, have laid their finger repeatedly on the weak spots in our system and have suggested remedies. But little heed seems to have been paid to their advice and we seem to have muddled along until we have reached the critical position in which we are today. I trust that the advice of this Board will be viewed with less suspicion, that it will be acted upon and that it will not be the starting point for another series of academic ponderings.

"One suspicion, I think I can dispell at once. It is not the object of this Board to place hindrances in the advance of education, nor do they cast a malignant eye on universities. Most of the Indians here are the products of Indian universities. We owe to them more than we can say. We have no desire to deny to others the opportunities which have made us what we are. We also recognise the great benefits that universities have conferred on India. They have been the channels for the flow of western ideas and western learning. They have exerted a profound influence on the political and social development of this country. But the rapid expansion of university education has brought to the fore many new problems. The Board knows fully that the first universities were established in the Presidency towns in 1857. The next university was established in 1882 in the Punjab and in my own province a university was established at Allahabad in 1887. From 1857 to 1887 there were only five uni- versities of the affiliating type.

This number continued till 1915. Between 1916 and 1929, that is in these 13 years, 13 more universities were added, some of these of course of a unitary and residential type; but the total number has now increased to eighteen. On an average these universities turn out about 12,000 graduates in Arts and Science. The wastage is enormous. Practically in all the examinations from Matriculation to the B.A. degree, nearly half the students fail to succeed. If then we sound a note of warning, if we wish to point the way to reform, it is because most of us are deeply impressed by the tragic spectacle of thousands of young men drifting aimlessly through life and we ask ourselves the question whether all this frustration of youthful hopes and ambitious and effort is inevitable. It is well known that when students enter a university, it is not merely for the purpose of acquiring knowledge or the formation of character, but in the hope that at the end of a successful career they will be able to earn a living if, therefore, the universities turn out men in such numbers that they cannot find a livelihood afterwards, it is obvious that we are accumulating explosive material which may in the end blow up the foundations of stable society.

It is obvious that a large number of unemployed young men cannot possibly have much affection or regard for an order of

society in which they cannot fill up an honourable role. Few will deny that many crowd into our universities who are unsuited by their aptitudes to receive the education which a university should offer, and this pressure of numbers tends further to lower standards. We have therefore to ask ourselves the question whether, in a poor country like India, the universities should not confine themselves mainly to the aristocracy of intellect and give them the precedence and preference which nature seems to have designed for them? Or, are we to go on the theory that although all are not born intellectually equal, yet all must have the same opportunities of receiving university education on a somewhat uniform pattern?

I should also like the Board to consider whether we are sure that India is making a contribution to the advancement of human knowledge which may be considered worthy of her great intellectual past, the vastness of its population, the natural intelligence of her people and the traditional esteem in which learning is held in this country. And if it is not, may it not be that we are not concentrating on the best intellectual material available. Perhaps some enthusiasts may consider that these criticisms are in the nature of a sacrilege, that university education is in danger. I think, however, that the greater danger is that if early steps are not taken, the whole of the social structure may crash over our heads before we know where we are. Nor can the universities take up an attitude of complete academic detachment and cut themselves off from the subsequent fortunes of their students.

In view of this serious situation the Board, in a spirit of realism, considered the problem of educational reconstruction and passed last year a series of most important and far-reaching resolutions suggesting a radical reform of the system of secondary education, so that apart from its providing instruction which would lead to universities and to professional colleges, there be stages from which students could branch off either to private occupations or to vocational schools. These resolutions were forwarded to local governments and the Government of India indicated that they would be prepared to assist in getting expert advice on these matters. Most of the local governments, I am glad to say, fell in with the proposal and we were able to get this year two experts to whom I extend a very warm welcome Mr. Abbott,

former Chief Inspector of Technical Schools, Board of Education and Mr. Wood, the Director of Intelligence, Board of Education and the Ministry of Health. Unfortunately, because of the shortness of time, we were not able to get other experts whom we thought it would be desirable to get in order to have a simultaneous survey of educational problems throughout India. I am afraid, within the time allotted; Mr. Wood and Mr. Abbott will probably only be able to make detailed recommendations in regard to the provinces of Delhi, the Punjab and United Provinces. They may, if they have time, be able to visit Bengal and Bombay. We await their report with the greatest possible interest.

"Another Resolution which the Board passed last year was in regard to the revival of the Bureau of Education. This will be done and the intention is that the Bureau will supply information and under its supervision, accounts of new experiments in educational practice will issue.

"Ladies and Gentlemen, the question of education has to be considered as a whole. We are therefore asking you this year to examine two vital problems : the problem of boys' primary education and the problem of primary education for girls. As regards boys' education, I do not propose to repeat here what I had to say during the course of the discussion in the Council of State. As regards girls, education, the report of the Committee has already been circulated and here I should like to take this opportunity of thanking the Chairman and Members of the Committee for their report and specially the lady members, Lady Grigg and Rajkumari Amrit Kaur. As regards girls' education, we all feel that unless we can educate our girls it is not possible to do very much to improve the conditions of life in our villages or to inculcate habits of thrift or to remove crippling social customs or to break down illiteracy and we feel that this is an opportune moment for making a definite advance in girls' education because as all of us know there has been a great awakening of women during recent years. As regards primary education, apart from all other reasons which have been previously emphasised by commissions and committees, it is obvious that democratic institutions in which the bulk of the electorate is illiterate have a danger of their own. They provide a fertile field for the demagogue and they also widen the gulf between the classes and the masses in outlook and feeling. It is therefore important not only to train leaders, but also to remove the dead weight of illiteracy from the masses. I recognise the magnitude of the problem.

We all know that one of the great difficulties in the advance of primary education is the question of funds and in the papers which have been circulated to you, you will see that over 8 million boys and over 13 million girls are still without instruction and that the recurring cost of bringing these under instruction will be over Rs. 19 crores a year. But finance is not the only problem. We all know the immense waste that takes place. From 1921, the total expenditure on education has increased by over 50 per cent. It is now Rs. 26 1/2 crores. But if we look at the figures of literacy there has not been much improvement made during the last 30 years. More than 90 per cent of the people are still illiterate. That indicates the vast dimensions of the problem which we have to tackle.

This Board was revived last year after a lapse of 12 years. It was originally started in 1921, but in 1923, due to financial stringency the Board's activities were suspended. Its composition and its representative character offers an opportunity for many-sided, but practical discussion of educational problems and I think we are all agreed that the need for periodic discussion will be more and not less when provincial autonomy is established because there is a great risk of provinces dealing with these questions from too narrow an angle. The Board began very auspiciously last year under the able guidance of Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai whom we are all glad to see here today. I trust that your labours for the advancement of education on right lines will be crowned with success in the coming years and that you will soon be regarded as the friend and guide of those who seek to bring a little sunshine into the lives of our people by the spread of knowledge suited to their needs and circumstances. We all realise the difficulty of the task, but it is well worth all the labour and energy and ability which we can put into it, because without a sound and far- flung system of education, India cannot hope to make much progress, nor can she take a place among the nations of the world which may be worthy of her people and worthy of her cultured past."

Agenda:-The Board was invited to consider the following Agenda :-

(1) Confirmation of the proceedings of the first meeting of the Central Advisory Board of

(2) Resolutions of the Inter-University Board passed at its meeting held in February, 1936, viz.-

(a) the Inter-University Board should continue to function as a National Committee on Intellectual Cooperation in India so far as questions of higher education are concerned, and

(b) the Inter-University Board welcome the idea of the Central Advisory Board of Education functioning as a National Centre of Educational Information.

(3) University education- (i) Report of the Unemployment Committee, United Provinces, 1935. Chapter Xi, para 328 and Chapter XII, Para 347 (3), (4), (6), (8) and (9).

(ii) Equivalence and standardisation of university degrees in India.

(4) Primary education- (i) Report of the Unemployment Committee, United Provinces, 1935. Chapter XII, para 332(2), (3) and (4).

(iii) Proceedings of the Council of State, dated the 16th March 1936, relating to the resolution regarding removal of mass illiteracy.

(5) Report of the Women's Education Committee of the Central Advisory Board of Education on primary education of girls in India.

(6) Collection of statistics of the educated unemployed in India.

(7) Note on the reception of the scheme of educational reorganisation by the provinces and the visit of experts from England to advise in the matter.

(8) Uniform classification of schools in India.

(9) Education of defectives.

(10) Filling up of vacancies on the standing committees appointed by the Board.

(11) Fixation of the date and place for the third annual meeting of the Board.

Proceedings :- The Board then considered the agenda and adopted the following resolutions :-

(1) The proceedings of the first meeting of the Board were confirmed.

(2) The Board then considered item No. 2 which related to the question of-

(a) the formation of a National Committee on Intellectual Cooperation in India, and

(b) the Central Advisory Board of Education functioning as a National Centre of Educational Information for India.

At its first meeting the Board had decided to refer the following two propositions to the Inter-University Board for opinion :-

(1) Whether existing arrangements whereby the Education Commissioner with the Government of India acts as Correspondent with the Secretariat of the International Committee of the League of Nations and with the Director of the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation at Paris should continue, or whether any steps be taken for the formation of a National Committee on Intellectual Cooperation in India; and

(2) Whether the Inter-University Board, India, or the Central Advisory Board of Education should act as the National Centre of Educational Information for India.

The Inter-University Board considered these two propositions at its meeting held in February 1936 and passed the following resolutions

(1) The Inter-University Board should continue to function as a National Committee on Intellectual Cooperation in India so far as questions of higher education are concerned.

(2) The Inter-University Board welcomes the idea of the Central Advisory Board of Education functioning as a National Centre of Educational Information in India,

These resolutions were now considered by the Central Advisory Board of Education. It was resolved that "The views of the Inter-University Board should again be. obtained before the matter is discussed further by the Central Advisory Board of Education."

(7) Item No. 4 of the agenda, viz., primary education, was then taken up. It was agreed that the problem of primary education was primarily one of finance, and that unless more money was available, little could be done. Again, laxity of administration bad to be tightened in order fully to utilise the funds available. At this stage, Mr. Wood explained the functions of His Majesty's Inspectors of Schools and the relations between the Board of Education, England, and the local authorities. The nature of the inspectorate, the need of modifying district and municipal Acts in respect to the supervision of primary education and other suggestions to improve the administration, were discussed. It was decided that-

"the matter should be referred to the Vernacular Education Committee of the Board with definite suggestions, viz. :-

(i) whether the provincial ministries of education have sufficient powers of control or not in regard to primary education or whether these powers should be strengthened in any direction;

(ii) how the inspecting agency should be appointed and controlled;

(iii) whether it is essential or desirable that compulsion should be introduced in order that provincial governments may be able to enforce efficiency through the grants; and

(iv) whether primary education should be controlled by a central board of education in each province of which the minister should be in charge."

The meeting then adjourned for lunch.

(8) When the Board reassembled after lunch, the Hon'ble Kunwar Sir Jagdish Prasad requested the Hon'ble Khan Bahadur M. Aziz-ul-Haque to explain to the Board the

main proposals of the Women's Education Committee of the Board in regard to the primary education of girls in India. The Board agreed that there was not very much that it could add to the report of the Committee but emphasised the need of regarding the resolutions not as pious aspirations but as immediate goals. After a general discussion, it was decided that-

"a copy of the report of the Women's Education Committee of the Board should be forwarded to local governments for their comments, and that at the same time a sub-committee should be appointed (with reference to resolution No. 13 of the Committee) to consider the curriculum of girls' primary schools in India."

(9) The next item on the agenda, viz., 6, related to the collection of statistics of the educated unemployed in India. The difficulties which prevented the collection of reliable statistics of unemployment were emphasised. The creation by universities of employment bureaux to effect contact between graduates and employers might have some effect whilst another suggestion was that colleges should keep a record of the students who passed out each year. Certain members pointed out that this had been a attempted in some provinces and had usually failed mainly for reasons connected with the students themselves. The general feeling was that-

"the colleges and universities should as far as possible keep in touch with their students after they leave the institutions."

(10) In connection with item No. 7 on the agenda, Mr. Abbott and Mr. Wood, after a general discussion, stated that no final solution could be expected after so short a period of investigation.

(11) As regards item No. 8, viz., the uniform classification of schools in India, it was the general opinion that at present a uniform classification was not possible or

even desirable as any reorganisation might involve fundamental changes.

(12) Item No. 9-the education of defectives. It was decided that- "the education of these unfortunate children should not be neglected and local governments should be asked to report what the present position is in the provinces."

(13) Item No. 10 related to the filling up of certain vacancies on the standing committees of the Board. Mr. R. M. Statham, Director of Public Instruction, Madras, was appointed to the Women's Education Committee in place of the late Dr. A. H. Mackenzie and to the Vernacular Education Committee in place of Sir S. Radhakrishnan who had resigned his membership of the Board on account of his absence from India. Mr. M. R. Jayakar was appointed to the Secondary Education Committee in place of Mr. H. F. Saunders who had ceased to be a member of the Board and consequently of the Committee. Lady Grigg was added to the Secondary Education Committee. Mr. H. Dippie, Director of Public Instruction, Orissa, was appointed to the Vernacular Education Committee in place of Mr. J. E. Parkinson, who would now be an ex-officio member of this Committee in his capacity of Education Commissioner with the Government of India. Mr. V. N. Chandavarkar, Vice-Chancellor, Bombay University, was appointed to the Vocational and Professional Education Committee in place of Sir K. Ramunni Menon who had ceased to be a member of the Board and consequently of its committee on account of the dissolution of the Council of State by which body he had been elected on the Board.

(a) the Board consider it desirable that at an early stage a National Committee on Intellectual Cooperation should be set up in India and that the Education Commissioner with the Government of India should at present continue to act as the Correspondent as he has been hitherto doing; and

(b) the Board should act as a National Centre of Educational Information for India on the understanding that when supplying information the Education Commissioner should obtain any information that is necessary from the Secretary of the Inter-University Board or refer any important questions to that Board if the opinions of that Board have to be forwarded."

(3) The Board next discussed item No. 3(i), viz., university education. The various items were either recommendations or had been commented on by the Sapru Committee on Unemployment (1935) :

(a) the raising of fees charged in universities;

(b) the prescribing of limit to admissions of students to universities;

(c) the content of education as given in the universities, i.e., the need of greater stress on scientific and vocational education;

(d) the system of co-ordination between different universities so as to secure uniformity of standards and prevent unhealthy competition;

(e) the setting up of an Advisory Grants Committee to advise the Ministry of Education in regard to the grants which are made to the universities for research work; and

(f) the sending of students overseas for further education.

It was explained that enquiries had been made from local governments. From the replies received it was clear that, for one reason or another, the proposal to raise fees was unpopular. After discussion the Board decided that- " the question, of university education should be referred to the Inter-University Board for opinion with a request that it should examine the question whether or not it was both desirable and possible to increase fees for legal and other professional studies."

(4) It was pointed out that for various reasons commercial firms, both Indian and European, were reluctant to appoint

graduates of commerce. One suggestion was that the Board should impress not only on government departments but also on European and Indian commercial communities the desirability of absorbing these qualified young men. On the other hand, it was pointed out that the education and training imparted in the colleges did not appear to fit the new graduates for commercial life as they were not always prepared either to accept the initial position offered or to welcome the hard work expected. No resolution was formulated.

(5) It was generally agreed that provinces were preparing more lawyers than could be absorbed in the profession, and that the standard of legal knowledge was not high. It was suggested that the course should be raised to three years (instead of two years). This step has already been taken recently by some universities but with a consequent considerable fall in enrolment. Some members were of opinion that the extension of the course to three years was not necessarily a remedy. In view of the difference of the nature of legal work the possibility of devising a system by which there might be two classes of lawyers-one for the mofussil and one for presidency towns-was considered. It was agreed that this point should be examined by the Inter-University Board.

(6) As regards the question of the equivalence and standardisation of university degrees in India, the possibility of having external examiners was considered. The difficulties of creating and maintaining a uniform standard throughout India were appreciated. In the end it was resolved that

He died shortly after India's independence, on January 20, 1949 in Allahabad.

7

Narendra Deva

Acharya Narendra Deva (1889-1956) was one of the leading theorists of the Congress Socialist Party in India. His democratic socialism renounced violent means as a matter of principle, and embraced the satyagraha as a revolutionary tactic.

Deva was first drawn to nationalism around 1915 under the influence of B G Tilak and Aurobindo Ghosh. As a teacher he became interested in Marxism and Buddhism. He was also active in the Hindi language movement. He was a key leader of Congress Socialist Party from its founding in 1934, and was imprisoned several times during the freedom struggle. He was at various times a member of the Uttar Pradesh legislative assembly, and after 1948 served as vice-chancellor of Lucknow University.

Narendra Deva advocated the abolition of poverty and exploitation not just through his belief in the Marxist materialist dialectic, but especially on moral and humanistic grounds. Furthermore, he insisted that "without political democracy social democracy was a sham". Deva was active in the peasant movement and served as president of the All-India Kisan Congress. He was also an atheist, rejecting the glorification of God which, he argued, by implication denigrated humankind.

He remained associated with the Socialist Party and its successor, the Praja Socialist Party, until his death in 1956.

The Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology was named in his honour in 1975.

Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi has said: "Acharya Narnedra Dev was one of the greatest sons of India nad the nation owes

a great debt to him." In an address to the All-India congress, Jawaharlal Nehru said:

> *The death of Acharya Narendra Deva is something much bigger for many of us and, I think, for the country than just the passing away of an important person. He was a man of rare distinction--distinction in many fields--rare in spirit, rare in mind and intellect, rare in integrity of mind and otherwise. Only his body failed him. I do not know if there is any person present here in this House who was associated with him for a longer period than I was. Over 40 years ago we came together and we shared innumerable experiences together in the dust and heat fo the struggle for independence and in the long silence of prison life where we spent--I forget now--four or five years together at various places, and inevitably got to know each other intimately; and so, for many of us, it is a grievous loss and a grievous blow, even as it is a grievous loss for our country. There is the public sense of loss and there is the private sense of loss and a feeling that somebody of rare distinction has gone and it will be very difficult to find his like again.*

The founder of the Democratic Socialist Movement in India, Acharya Narendra Deo was a noted politician as well as theorist.

Acharya Narendra Deo was born on October 30, 1889 in Sitapur, Uttar Pradesh. Following the footsteps of his father who was an advocate, Acharya Narendra Dev also completed his education in law. However, the then prevalent fervor of independence and nationalism led him to being one of the pioneers of the Freedom Movement.

Acharya Narendra Deo was drawn into national politics primarily influenced by the likes of Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Aurobindo Ghosh around 1915. His interest lay in Marxism and Buddhism and this led to his principles of democratic socialism being based on non- violent means. Influenced by Mahatma Gandhi he accepted 'Satyagraha' as the means of struggle for independence. His theoretical contribution towards philosophy and culture of Budhhism is of paramount importance.

Acharyaji was an active member of the Congress Socialist Party right from its inception in 1934 and went on to become a

member of the Praja Socialist Party till his demise in 1956. Narendra Deo was imprisoned quite a number of times during the freedom movement and was first elected to the Legislative Assembly of Uttar Pradesh in 1938 and then in 1946. He served as a member of the Legislative Council of Uttar Pradesh between 1952 - 54 and was a member of the Rajya Sabha between 1954-56.

An educationist of repute, Acharya Narendra Deo served as the Vice Chancellor of Lucknow University after 1948. Keeping his contributions in mind, the Narendra Deo University of Agriculture and Technology was established in 1975. Acharya Deo died on February 19, 1956.

8

VINOBA BHAVE

Vinoba Bhave,born Vinayak Narahari Bhave (September 11, 1895 - November 15 1982) often called Acharya (In Sanskrit and Hindi means teacher), is considered as a National Teacher of India and the spiritual successor of Mahatma Gandhi.

EARLY LIFE

He was born in Gagode, Maharashtra on September 11, 1895 into a pious family of the Chitpavan Brahmin clan. He was highly inspired after reading the Bhagavad Gita, one of the holiest Hindu scriptures at a very early age.

Freedom Struggle

He was associated with Mahatma Gandhi in the Indian independence movement. In 1932 he was sent to jail by the British colonial government because of his fight against British rule. There he gave a series of talks on the Gita, in his native language Marathi, to his fellow prisoners.

These highly inspiring talks were later published as the book "Talks on the Gita", and it has been translated to many languages both in India and elsewhere. Vinoba felt that the source of these talks was something above and he believed that its influence will endure even if his other works were forgotten.

In 1940 he was chosen by Gandhi to be the first Individual Satyagrahi (an Individual standing up for Truth instead of a collective action) against the British rule. Bhave also participated in the Quit India Movement.

Religious and Social Work

Vinoba's religious outlook was very broad and it synthesized the truths of many religions. This can be seen in one of his hymns "Om Tat" which contains symbols of many religions.

Vinoba observed the life of the average Indian living in a village and tried to find solutions for the problems he faced with a firm spiritual foundation. This formed the core of his Sarvodaya (Awakening of all potentials) movement. Another example of this is the Bhoodan (land gift) movement. He walked all across India asking people with land to consider him as one of their sons and so give him a portion of their land which he then distributed to landless poor. Non-violence and compassion being a hallmark of his philosophy, he also campaigned against the slaughtering of cows.

Vinoba was a scholar, thinker, writer who produced numerous books, translator who made Sanskrit texts accessible to common man, orator, linguist who had excellent command of several languages (Marathi, Hindi, Urdu, English, Sanskrit), and a social reformer.

All revolutions are spiritual at the source. All my activities have the sole purpose of achieving a union of hearts. —*Vinoba*

Jai jagat!—Victory to the world! —*Vinoba*

Once India gained its independence, that nation's leaders did not take long to abandon Mahatma Gandhi's principles.

Nonviolence gave way to the use of India's armed forces. Perhaps even worse, the new leaders discarded Gandhi's vision of a decentralized society—a society based on autonomous, self-reliant villages. These leaders spurred a rush toward a strong central government and an industrial economy as found in the West.

Yet Gandhi's vision was not abandoned by all. Many of Gandhi's "constructive workers"—development experts and community organizers working in a host of agencies set up by Gandhi himself—resolved to continue his mission of transforming Indian society. Leading them was a disciple of Gandhi previously little known to the Indian public, yet eventually regarded as

Gandhi's "spiritual successor": a saintly, reserved, austere individual called Vinoba.

In 1916, at the age of 20, Vinoba was in the holy city of Benares trying to come to a decision. Should he go to the Himalaya mountains and become a religious hermit? Or should he go to West Bengal and join the guerillas fighting the British?

Then Vinoba came across a newspaper account of a speech by Gandhi. Vinoba was thrilled. Soon after, he joined Gandhi in his ashram. (An ashram is a religious community—but for Gandhians, it is also a center for political and social action.)

As Vinoba later said, he found in Gandhi the peace of the Himalayas united with the revolutionary fervor of Bengal.

Gandhi greatly admired Vinoba, commenting that Vinoba understood Gandhian thought better than he himself did. In 1940 he showed his regard by choosing Vinoba over Nehru to lead off a national protest campaign against British war policies.

After Gandhi's assassination on January 30, 1948, many of Gandhi's followers looked to Vinoba for direction. Vinoba advised that, now that India had reached its goal of Swaraj—independence, or self-rule—the Gandhians' new goal should be a society dedicated to Sarvodaya, the "welfare of all."

The name stuck, and the movement of the Gandhians became known as the Sarvodaya Movement. A merger of constructive work agencies produced Sarva Seva Sangh—"The Society for the Service of All"—which became the core of the Sarvodaya Movement, as the main Gandhian organization working for broad social change along Gandhian lines.

Vinoba had no desire to be a leader, preferring a secluded ashram life. This preference, though, was overturned by events in 1951, following the yearly Sarvodaya conference in what is now the central Indian state of Andhra Pradesh. At the close of that conference, Vinoba announced his intention to journey through the nearby district of Telengana.

He couldn't have picked a more troubled spot.

Telengana was at that moment the scene of an armed insurrection. Communist students and some of the poorest villagers had united in a guerilla army. This army had tried to break the land monopoly of the rich landlords by driving them out or killing them and distributing their land.

At the height of the revolt, the guerrillas had controlled an area of 3,000 villages. But the Indian army had been sent in and had begun its own campaign of terror. Now, many villages were occupied by government troops during the day and by Communists at night. Each side would kill villagers they suspected of supporting the other side. So most villagers lived in terror of both sides. The government had clearly shown it would win, but the conflict wasn't nearly over by the time of the Sarvodaya conference. Vinoba hoped to find a solution to the conflict and to the injustice that had spawned it. So, refusing police escort, he and a small company set off on foot.

On April 18, the third day of his walk, Vinoba stopped in the village of Pochampalli, which had been an important Communist stronghold. Setting himself up in the courtyard of a Muslim prayer compound, he was soon receiving visitors from all the factions in the village.

Among the visitors was a group of 40 families of landless Harijans. (Harijan was Gandhi's name for the Untouchables, the outcasts from Hindu society. Literally, it means "child of God.") The Harijans told Vinoba they had no choice but to support the Communists, because only the Communists would give them land. They asked, Would Vinoba ask the government instead to give them land?

Vinoba replied, "What use is government help until we can help ourselves?" But he himself wasn't satisfied by the answer. He was deeply perplexed.

Late that afternoon, by a lake next to the village, Vinoba held a prayer meeting that drew thousands of villagers from the surrounding area. Near the beginning of the meeting, he presented the Harijans' problem to the assembly. Without really expecting a response, he said, "Brothers, is there anyone among you who can help these Harijan friends?"

A prominent farmer of the village stood up. "Sir, I am ready to give one hundred acres."

Vinoba could not believe his ears.

Here, in the midst of a civil war over land monopoly, was a farmer willing to part with 100 acres out of simple generosity. And Vinoba was just as astounded when the Harijans declared that they needed only 80 acres and wouldn't accept more!

Vinoba suddenly saw a solution to the region's turmoil. In fact, the incident seemed to him a sign from God. At the close of the prayer meeting, he announced he would walk all through the region to collect gifts of land for the landless.

So began the movement called Bhoodan—"land-gift." Over the next seven weeks, Vinoba asked for donations of land for the landless in 200 villages of Telengana. Calculating the amount of India's farmland needed to supply India's landless poor, he would tell the farmers and landlords in each village, "I am your fifth son. Give me my equal share of land." And in each village—to his continued amazement—the donations poured in.

Who gave, and why?

At first most of the donors were farmers of moderate means, including some who themselves owned only an acre or two. To them, Vinoba was a holy man, a saint, the Mahatma's own son, who had come to give them God's message of kinship with their poorer neighbors. Vinoba's prayer meetings at times took on an almost evangelical fervor. As for Vinoba, he accepted gifts from even the poorest—though he sometimes returned these gifts to the donors—because his goal was as much to open hearts as to redistribute land.

Gradually, though, the richer landowners also began to give. Of course, many of their gifts were inspired by fear of the Communists and hopes of buying off the poor—as the Communists were quick to proclaim.

But not all the motives of the rich landowners were economic. Many of the rich hoped to gain "spiritual merit" through their gifts; or at least to uphold their prestige. After all, if poor farmers were willing to give sizeable portions of their land to Vinoba, could the rich be seen to do less? And perhaps a few of the rich were even truly touched by Vinoba's message.

In any case, as Vinoba's tour gained momentum, even the announced approach of the "god who gives away land" was enough to prepare the landlords to part with some of their acreage.

Soon Vinoba was collecting hundreds of acres a day. What's more, wherever Vinoba moved, he began to dispel the climate of tension and fear that had plagued the region. In places where people had been afraid to assemble, thousands gathered to hear him—including the Communists.

At the end of seven weeks, Vinoba had collected over 12,000 acres. After he left, Sarvodaya workers continuing to collect land in his name received another 100,000 acres.

The Telengana march became the launching point for a nationwide campaign that Vinoba hoped would eliminate the greatest single cause of India's poverty: land monopoly. He hoped as well that it might be the lever needed to start a "nonviolent revolution"—a complete transformation of Indian society by peaceful means.

The root of oppression, he reasoned, is greed. If people could be led to overcome their possessiveness, a climate would be created in which social division and exploitation could be eliminated. As he later put it, "We do not aim at doing mere acts of kindness, but at creating a Kingdom of Kindness."

Soon Vinoba and his colleagues were collecting 1,000 acres a day, then 2,000, then 3,000. Several hundred small teams of Sarvodaya workers and volunteers began trekking from village to village, all over India, collecting land in Vinoba's name. Vinoba himself—despite advanced age and poor health—marched continually, touring one state after another.

The pattern of Vinoba's day was daily the same. Vinoba and his company would rise by 3:00 a.m. and hold a prayer meeting for themselves. Then they would walk ten or twelve miles to the next village, Vinoba leading at a pace that left the others struggling breathlessly behind. With him were always a few close assistants, a bevy of young, idealistic volunteers—teenagers and young adults, male and some female, mostly from towns or cities—plus maybe some regular Sarvodaya workers, a landlord, a politician, or an interested Westerner.

At the host village they would be greeted by a brass band, a makeshift archway, garlands, formal welcomes by village leaders, and shouts of "Sant Vinoba, Sant Vinoba!" ("Saint Vinoba!")

After breakfast, the Bhoodan workers would fan out through the village, meeting the villagers, distributing literature, and taking pledges. Vinoba himself would be settled apart, meeting with visitors, reading newspapers, answering letters.

In late afternoon, there would be a prayer meeting, attended by hundreds or thousands of villagers from the area. After a period of reciting and chanting, Vinoba would speak to the crowd in his quiet, high-pitched voice. His talk would be completely improvised, full of rich images drawn from Hindu scripture or everyday life, exhorting the villagers to lives of love, kinship, sharing. At the close of the meeting, more pledges would be taken.

There were no free weekends on this itinerary, no holidays, no days off. The man who led this relentless crusade was 57 years old, suffered from chronic dysentery, chronic malaria, and an intestinal ulcer, and restricted himself, because of his ulcer, to a diet of honey, milk, and yogurt.

As the campaign gained momentum, friends and detractors alike watched in fascination. In the West, too, Vinoba's effort drew attention. In the United States, major articles on Vinoba appeared in the New York Times, the New Yorker—Vinoba even appeared on the cover of Time.

By the time of the 1954 Sarvodaya conference, the Gandhians had collected over 3 million acres nationwide. The total eventually reached over 4 million. Much of this land turned out to be useless, and in many cases landowners reneged on their pledges. Still, the Gandhians were able to distribute over 1 million acres to India's landless poor—far more than had been managed by the land reform programs of India's government. About half a million families benefited.

Meanwhile, Vinoba was shifting his efforts to a new gear—a higher one.

After 1954, Vinoba began asking for "donations" not so much of land but of whole villages. He named this new program Gramdan—"village-gift."

Gramdan was a far more radical program than Bhoodan. In a Gramdan village, all land was to be legally owned by the village as a whole, but parceled out for the use of individual families, according to need. Because the families could not themselves sell, rent, or mortgage the land, they could not be pressured off it during hard times—as normally happens when land reform programs bestow land title on poor individuals.

Village affairs were to be managed by a village council made up of all adult members of the village, making decisions by consensus—meaning the council could not adopt any decision until everyone accepted it. This was meant to ensure cooperation and make it much harder for one person or group to benefit at the expense of others.

While Bhoodan had been meant to prepare people for a nonviolent revolution, Vinoba saw Gramdan as the revolution itself.

Like Gandhi, Vinoba believed that the divisiveness of Indian society was a root cause of its degradation and stagnation. Before the villagers could begin to improve their lot, they needed to learn to work together. Gramdan, he felt, with its common land ownership and cooperative decision-making, could bring about the needed unity.

And once this was achieved, the "people's power" it would release would make anything possible.

Vinoba's Gramdan efforts progressed slowly until 1965, when an easing of Gramdan's requirements was joined to the launching of a "storm campaign." By 1970, the official figure for Gramdan villages was 160,000—almost one-third of all India's villages!

But it turned out that it was far easier to get a declaration of Gramdan than to set it up in practice. By early 1970, only a few thousand villages had transferred land title to a village council. In most of these, progress was at a standstill. What's more, most of these few thousand villages were small, single-caste, or tribal—not even typical Indian villages. By 1971, Gramdan as a movement had collapsed under its own weight.

Still, the Gramdan movement left behind more than a hundred Gramdan "pockets"—some made up of hundreds of villages—

where Gandhian workers settled in for long-term development efforts. These pockets today form the base of India's Gandhian movement. In these locales, the Gandhians are helping some of India's poorest by organizing Gandhian-style community development and nonviolent action campaigns against injustice.

As for Vinoba, he returned to his ashram for the final time in June 1970, after thirteen years of continual marching and five more of presiding over the "storm campaign."

During his final years, Vinoba continued to inspire new programs—for instance, Women's Power Awakening, a Gandhian version of women's liberation. He also launched an ongoing campaign against "cow slaughter" to try to halt the butchering of useful farm animals, a practice destructive of India's traditional agriculture.

In the mid-1970s, Vinoba and some close followers became estranged from Sarva Seva Sangh when he opposed the nationwide protest movement of fellow Gandhian Jayaprakash Narayan against the government of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi (no relation to the Mahatma). The "JP Movement" led to Indira Gandhi's infamous declaration of Emergency and then indirectly to her temporary ouster from office. In the long run, the value of that movement's accomplishments proved open to question, and much of Vinoba's criticism of it was borne out.

Vinoba stands as a symbol for the struggle of the good against the evil, of spiritual against the mundane. He was a spiritual visionary, whose spirituality had a pragmatic stance with intense concern for the deprived. He was a brilliant scholar who could knowledge accessible to ordinary people. He was Gandhi's ardent follower, who could retain originality in thinking. As S. Radhakrishnan pointed out, "Indeed his life represents harmonious blend of learning, spiritual perception and compassion for the lowly and the lost." His Bhoodan (Gift of the Land) movement started on April 18, 1951, he attracted the attention of the world. Untouched by publicity and attention, Vinoba had continued his efforts for a just and equitable society. In fact, his life is a saga of his commitment to nonviolent ways of bringing change, his yearning for the highest level of spirituality and his unwavering faith in human values and love.

Vinoba was born in a Brahmin family on September 11, 1895 at the village of Gagoda in Kolaba district of Maharashtra. He was named Vinayak at birth and was influenced by his mother Rukmini Devi, a religious woman. His younger brother, Balkoba Shivaji, remained unmarried and adopted a life of renunciation and service to humanity like him.

Vinoba, well-read in the writings of Maharashtra's saints and philosophers at a young age and deeply interested in Mathematics, was attracted to the core of learning. Naturally, the routine course-work was not enough to quench his thirst for knowledge. His two years in the college remained full of internal uneasiness and agitation. Early in 1916, he put his school and college certificate in a fire on his way to Mumbai in March 1916 to appear for the intermediate examination. He took a fateful decision not to reach Mumbai, but to reach Varanasi (also called Kashi, then called Benaras). This decision was motivated by his longing to attain the imperishable and all pervading Brahma. He got into the study of ancient Sanskrit test.

The report in the newspapers about Gandhi's speech at the newly founded Benaras Hindu University attracted Vinoba's attention. He wrote a letter to Gandhi. After an exchange of letters, Gandhi advised Vinoba to come for a personal meeting at Kochrab Ashram in Ahmedabad.

Vinoba went and met Gandhi on June 7, 1916. This meeting changed the course of Vinoba's life. He had said later "When I was in Kashi, my main ambition was to go to the Himalayas. Also there was an inner longing to visit Bengal. But neither of the two dreams could realise. Providence took me to Gandhi and I found in him not only the peace of the Himalayas but also the burning fervor of resolution, typical of Bengal. I said to myself that both of my desires had been fulfilled. Over the years, the bond between Vinoba and Gandhi grew stronger. Vinoba participated with keen interest in the activities at Gandhi's ashram, like teaching, studying, spinning and improving the life of the community.

Asked by Gandhi to take charge of the ashram at Wardha, Vinoba went to Wardha on April 8, 1921. In 1923, he brought out `Maharashtra Dharma', a monthly in Marathi (regional language), which had his essays on the Upanishads. Later on, this monthly

became a weekly and continued for three years. His articles on the Abhangas of Sant Tukaram (a saint poet) published in it became popular. As time passed Vinoba continued his search for the self which task him to spiritual heights. His involvement with Gandhi's constructive programmes related to Khadi, village industries, new education (Nai Talim), sanitation and hygiene also kept on increasing.

In December 23, 1932, he shifted to Nalwadi (a village about two miles from Wardha town), from where he experimented his idea of supporting himself by spinning alone. Later, when he was sick in 1938, he shifted to what he called Paramdham Ashram in Paunar, which remained his headquarters.

Vinoba's involvement in the freedom movement during this period remained . In 1923, he was jailed for months at Nagda jail and Akola jail for taking a prominent part in the flag satyagraha at Nagpur. In 1925, he was sent by Gandhi to Vykon (in Kerala) to supervise the entry of the Harijans to the temple. In 1932, he was jailed for six months to Dhulia for raising his voice against the British rule. In 1940, he was selected by Gandhi as the first individual satyagrahi. He was jailed thrice during 1940-41 for individual satyagraha at Nagpur jails; first time for three months, second time for six months and third time for one year. Vinoba was not known nationally when Gandhi selected him for individual satyagraha. Gandhi had issued a statement on October 5, 1940 introducing Vinoba. It was stated there that "Vinoba believes in the necessity of the political independence of India. He is an accurate student of history. But he believes that real independence of the villagers is impossible without the constructive Programme of which khadi is the centre." Vinoba took part in the Quit India movement of 1942 for which he got an imprisonment of three years at Vellore and Seoni jails.

The jails for Vinoba had become the places of reading and writing. He saw the proofs of his book `Gitai' (Marathi translation of Gita) in the Dhulia jail. Lectures given by him on Gita to the colleagues in the Dhulia jail collected by Sane Guruji were later published as a book. Writing of the book "Swarajya Shastra" (the treatise of self rule) and the collection of the bhajans (religious songs) of the saint Gyaneshwar, Eknath and Namdev were

completed. In Nagpur jail, `Ishavasyavritti' and `Sthitaprajna Darshan' were written in the Seoni jail. Four languages of the South India were learnt by Vinoba at Vellore jail and the script of Lok Nagari was also created here after research. His writings covering diverse areas of religion, philosophy, education and Sarvi are thought-provoking and yet accessible to the common people. The popularity of his writings has proved his ability to relate to the people. The competence of this multi-lingual scholar as an editor was also of high order as displayed by his editing of `Maharashtra Dharma' (mentioned earlier), Sarvodaya (in Hindi) and Sevak (in Marathi).

In March 1948, Gandhi's followers and constructive workers met at Sevagram. The idea of Sarvodaya Samaj (society) surfaced and started getting acceptance. Vinoba got busy with activities which would sooth the wounds of the partition of the nation. In the beginning of 1950, he launched the programme of kanchan-mukti (freedom from dependence on gold, i.e. money) and Rishi-Kheti (cultivation without the use of bullocks as was practised by Rishis, i.e. the sages of ancient times). In April 1951, after attending the Sarvodaya conference at Shivnampalli, he started his peace-trek on foot through the violence-torn region of Telangana (now in Andhra Pradesh). The disturbances were caused by the communists. On April 18, 1951, his meeting with the villagers at Pochampalli opened a new chapter in the history of non-violent struggle. The Harijans of the village told him that they needed 80 acres of land to make a living. Referring to this, Vinoba asked the villagers if they could do something to solve this problem. To everybody's surprise, Ram Chandra Reddy, a landlord, got up and showed his willingess to give 100 acres of land. This incident, unplanned and unheard, showed a way to solve the problem of the landless. The Bhoodan (Gift of the Land) movement was launched.

The response to the movement was spontaneous. In Telangana, the gift of land averaged 200 acres of land per day. On the journey from Pavnar to Delhi, the average gift was 300 acres a day. Vinoba had put five crore acre as the target. While walking in Uttar Pradesh in May 1952, Vinoba received the gift of the whole village of Mangrath. This meant the people were prepared to all their

land for the benefit of all the villagers, not as individual bhoodan, but as community Gramdan (Gift of the Village). Vinoba received 23 lakh of land in Bihar, while walking from September 1952 to December 1954. Orissa, Tamil Nadu and Kerala contributed significantly to Gramdan. Vinoba firmly believed that, "We must establish the independent power of the people - this is to say, we must demonstrate a power opposed to the power of violence and other than the power to punish. The people are our God." Connected with Bhoodan and Gramdan, there were other programs. Important of these were Sampatti-Dan (Gift of the Wealth), Shramdan (Gift of the Labour), Shanti Sena (Army for Peace), Sarvodaya-Patra (the pot where every household gives daily handful of grain) and Jeevandan (Gift of Life). Jayprakash Narayan in 1954 gave the gift of his life. Vinoba acknowledged it by giving the gift of his life.

Vinoba knew the strength of the padayatra (march on foot). He walked for 13 years throughout India. He had left Paunar on September 12, 1951 and returned on April 10, 1964. He started his Toofan Yatra (journey with the speed of high-velocity wind), using a vehicle, in Bihar in July 1965, which lasted for almost four years. He covered thousands of miles, addressed thousands of meetings and mobilized the people cutting the barriers of caste, class, language and religion. Some dacoits from the notorious Chambal Valley (a hideout of dacoits in the northern India) surrendered themselves to Vinoba in May 1960. For Vinoba, it was a victory of nonviolence.

On June 7, 1966, 50 years after his meeting with Gandhi, Vinoba announced that he was feeling a strong urge to free himself from outer visible activities and enter inward hidden form of spiritual action. After traveling through India, he returned to Paunar on November 2, 1969 and on October 7, 1970, he announced his decision to stay in one place. He observed a year of silence from December 25, 1974 to December 25, 1975. In 1976, he undertook a fast to stop the slaughter of cows. His spiritual pursuits intensified as he withdrew from the activities. He breathed his last on November 15, 1982 at this ashram.

Vinoba's contribution to the history of nonviolent movement remains significant. It has to be admitted, however, that the

achievement of Bhoodan - Gramdan movement in the material terms was much below the expected target. According to an estimate in total 41,94,270 acres was obtained, and the land actual distributed according to 1975 statistics was 12,85,738 acres. 18,57,398 acres was found unfit for distribution. Some of the remaining land got entangled in legal hassles and some was deserved to be written off. As against it has to be noted that Vinoba's movement rekindled faith in non-violence and human values advocated by Gandhi. It presented an alternative to violence and a vision of non-violent society. It raised important questions regarding inequality prevalent in the society. Vinoba saw the land as the gift of God like air, water, sky and sunshine. He connected science with spirituality and the autonomous village with the world movement. He regarded the power of the people superior than power of the state. Many of his ideas remain relevant and inspiring in the strife-ridden modern times.

Vinayak Narahari Bhave, known as Vinoba, was born at Gagoda, in the Kolaba district of Maharashtra on 11 September 1895. Vinoba who was deeply attached to his mother, Rukminibai, inherited her austerity, asceticism and altruism. His father, Narahari Shambhurao, was an ardent advocate of western learning and science.

Vinoba was a brilliant student. He studied Sanskrit and became proficient in all Hindu scriptural books. He was a self-taught multilinguist.

Before Vinoba came into contact with Gandhiji, the perusal of the Dasabodh of Swami Ramdas and Tilak's writings in Kesari made him resolve to dedicate himself to the service of the country. At Sabarmati he began to expound the Bhagavad Gita. About the Gita, Vinoba said, "In all my actions, Gita has been my guide".

Once he became an ardent follower of the eleven vows, included in Gandhiji's daily prayer, Vinoba shed the last trace of untouchability left in him. One day he consigned to the flames his sacred thread, which signified Brahmin superiority. In his famous Bhoodan campaign, Harijans had a special consideration. As most of them were landless, he decided to distribute one-third of his land gains among Harijans. His aim was to make universal brotherhood a living reality for the rich and the poor alike.

He was one of the moving spirits behind the Nagpur Flag Satyagraha. In 1930 he was arrested and sent to prison for participating in the Dandi march. In prison Vinoba dictated his Maxims of Independence.

The Sevagram School was the first experimental base for Gandhiji's educational ideas, which Vinoba put into practice. After India became free he started the Sarvodaya movement for the establishment of equality. He fought for this until he breathed his last on 15 November 1982.

Of Vinoba, Gandhiji once said: "He is one of the Ashram's rare pearls—one of those who have come not to be blessed but to bless, not to receive but to give".

Later Life and Death

Vinoba spent the later part of his life at his ashram in Paunar, Maharashtra. He controversially backed the Indian Emergency imposed by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, calling it Anushasana Parva (Time for Discipline).

He fell ill in November 1982 and decided to end his life. He died on November 15, 1982 after refusing food and medicine for a few days. Some Indians have identified this as sallekhana or Praayopaveshan (renouncing life by refusing food and water).

Criticism

V. S. Naipaul has given scathing criticism of Bhave in his collection of essays citing his lack of connection with rationality and excessive imitation of Gandhi.

Awards

In 1958 Vinoba was the first recipient of the international Ramon Magsaysay Award for Community Leadership. He was awarded the Bharat Ratna posthumously in 1983.

Quotes

"All revolutions are spiritual at the source. All my activities have the sole purpose of achieving a union of hearts."

"Peace is something mental and spiritual. If there be peace in our (personal) life, it will affect the whole world"

"Jai Jagat! — Victory to the world!"

"It is a curious phenomena that God has made the hearts of the poor rich, and those of the rich poor."

"What we should aim at is the creation of people power, which is opposed to the power of violence and is different from the coercive power of state."

"A country should be defended not by arms, but by ethical behavior."

"We cannot fight new wars with old weapons."

"There is no need for me to protest against the government's faults, it is against its good deeds that my protests are needed."

"Do not allow yourself to imagine that revolutionary thinking can be propagated by governmental power."

"I beg you not to adopt any "go slow" methods of nonviolence. In nonviolence you must go full steam ahead, if you want the good to come speedily you must go about it with vigor. A merely soft, spineless ineffective kind of nonviolence will actually encourage the growth of the status quo and all the forces of a violent system which we deplore."

TALKS ON GITA OF VINOBA

Introduction

Of all the books by Vinoba Bhave, his talks on the Gita have been the best. An introduction to this book in his own words is as under:

`The Talks put the essence of the Gita into simple language and so bring it within the reach of the common man. They present the Gita from the standpoint of Samyayoga, so far as I have understood it. In the course of time my other services to the world may be forgotten, but I believe that Talks on the Gita will continue to give service. I say this because when I gave the Talks on the Gita, I did so in a state of Samadhi, in that state of consciousness which transcends the worlds.

Talks on Gita or (Gita-Pravachane) is a very lucid and logical interpretation of Gita, with remarkable precision. It is a record of talks (Pravachans) Vinoba gave to jail inmates in Dhule from

February 1932 to June 1932, on every Sunday. It was taken down verbatim by Sane Guruji. It has a very remarkable, directly appealing and simple style of its own. The most important concept he expounds in it is Pure action (Akanna). That is his personal contribution. His own explanation of this concept is as under :

`When I was studying the meaning of the Gita, it took me several years to absorb the fifth chapter. I consider that chapter to be the key to the whole book, and the key to that chapter is in the eighteenth verse of the fourth chapter : 'inaction in action, and action in inaction'.' The meaning of those words, as it revealed itself to me, casts its shadow over the whole of my "Talks on the Gita.

Vinoba has given a running commentary on all the 18 chapters of Gita but has chosen a different interpretation. Thread of discussion starts from Frustration - a means to spiritual growth, Non-conventional definition of Performance of duty (Swadhanna), Skill of Action - (Karmayoga), Inward effort - Basic parameter of Karmayoga, Action without activity - Akarma, One pointedness of mind - Akagratha, Devotion (Bhakti) - Redefined, Pure state of mind - SamskarMukti, Self-surrender - Basis of spiritual experience, Looking for God, The Vision of the Cosmic Form, Devotion with and without Form, The Self and the Non-self, Building up and Breaking down, Completeness of Vision, Conflict Between Divine And Demonic Tendencies, Programme for the Seeker, and ends with Grace of the Lord.

As mentioned in the introduction, these talks on Gita were given once a week in the prison at Dhule, one of the eastern districts in the state of Maharashtra where Vinoba was a political prisoner. Hardly there was a man of distinction in India who had not commented on the Gita. Vinoba was under a strong Gandhian influence and hence he worked out a different interpretation of this sacred text in line with the freedom movement that was in full swing at that time.

Although there are number of commentaries on Gita by distinguished scholars from India and abroad, Vinoba did not write such commentary. As mentioned earlier, his talks on Gita in Jail taken down verbatim by his jail inmate Sane Guruji were found so useful that printed version originally in Marathi was

widely appreciated in his home state and popularity of the Marathi version attracted people from other Indian states to translate this book in their own languages. We will now look to this interpretation chapter by chapter.

Yoga of Despondency

In the background of Gita is a war, between two families, ready to start. Arjuna the main hero on one side, looks at the family members, elders and friends on the other side and experiences a strong sense of frustration for infighting in the family. Although he was a great warrior, he merely broke-down by thinking on the utter futility of this war and in that moment of depression he asks his mentor about what he should do. The answer given by Shri Krishna is equally unexpected. He says your present reluctance to fight is illusion. Your problem is not regarding fight but the fight against my relatives, my brothers, my friends. Krishna says that your real fight has to be against Cr' and 'My) rather than the fight outside. It is in this context of how to come out of our ego i.e. 'I' and the result of the ego i.e. CMv' that all the seventeen chapters have been commented upon.

Self-Knowledge and Equanimity

The chapter deals with non-conventional definition of Performance of duty - Swadharma. This concept of swadharma in India of 1932 was largely interpreted as Hindu dharma or its sects and sub-sects along with the rituals and signs on the forehead, a mala or a rosary, a particular type of dress or the naming, caste and sex. Vinoba's contribution to the interpretation of swadharma is unique when he says that our swadharma comes to us with such ease and naturalness that we should cherish it without effort. But because of many kinds of illusion, this does not happen; or else, it is performed with great difficulty; or even if it is practised, it gets corrupted with many sorts of faults.

There are many external forms assumed by the illusion but, if we examine them, only one thing is at the bottom of it all, namely, a restricted and shallow identification of one self with the body. Myself, and those related to me through the body, sets the limits of my expansion. Anyone outside this circle is to me a stranger or an enemy. This identification with the body builds a

wall around me and cuts me off, and I regard only the bodies as "me" and "mine". Falling into this double trap of identification of oneself and one's people with the body we start putting up all sorts of little walls. Almost everybody is busy doing this. One man puts up an enclosure called ""attachment to family" and lives in it; another builds and lives in an enclosure called ""attachment to nation"". But what is the result of this ? Only one thing : the germs of base thoughts multiply, and the health which is swadharma is destroyed.

The practise of swadharma or the duty towards oneself, family, society and nation is to be progressively achieved by converting the intelligence or budhi to discriminating intelligence (vivekbudhi) which is also called Wisdom or Pragna.

Towards the end of this long chapter in the Gita are described the qualities of the man of steadfast mind (sthitaprajna) the embodiment of self-control i.e. controlling the organs of perception and action (indriyas). This control is not easy. But to do as the tortoise does, drawing in its limbs in times of danger, and using them when it is safe; to draw the senses away from objects, and to use them for higher services - this discipline is difficult but can be achieved by effort. A person established in 'Pragna' or 'Wisdom' becomes more balanced or equanimous and experiences his higher self which is beyond passion, greed and arrogance.

Yoga of Action

The third chapter on 'Karma-Yoga' or 'Yoga of Action' was interpreted in context of then prevailing life in India People in towns and villages were in high state of inactivity. Many of them had taken to addiction to tobacco opium or country liquor. Men were most of the time gossiping, and most of the manual work was thrust upon women. In the name of religion high class Hindus had developed a strong dislike towards poor members of society and were treating women as second class citizens. In large cities, men had taken to English education and life style as the highest aim of life. Manual work was to be avoided and white collar generation came into significant existence. People became 'intellectuals' rather than intelligent. There was 'inactivity' in villages and 'fruitless activity in cities'.

In this context, Vinoba like his predecessor Tilak once again draws the attention of Hindu society that Gita is not for Sanyasis but for House-holders and swadharma is to act. Dignity of labour and maintaining health by simple natural means was already established by his mentor Gandhi as a part of swadharma. Vinoba adds to the list the concept of 'bhavana' or 'love' as important ingredients of work.

Work has to be done for maintaining health, tilling and harvesting of land or craftsmanship of an artisan or merchandising of goods by merchants etc. All this should be directed towards growth of soul by adding love and earning money by fair means in return for work as a house-holder is expected to do.

As he illustrates this chapter, he says that 'result of karma-yogi's (skilful worker) action is that while his life goes on smoothly, his body and mind are radiant; and society too prospers. Besides these two benefits, he also receives the great gift of 'chitta-shudhi' or purity of mind ....,The Karma Yogi's work is a form of prayer (japa). His mind is purified by it, and the clear mind receives the image of 'jnana' or 'true knowledge'.

Illustrating this concept further, he gives example of Sena the barber. As he cleaned other people's heads wisdom came to him, 'Look, I remove the dirt from other's heads, but have I ever removed the dirt from my own head, from my own mind?' The language of the spirit came to him through his work. Again he says that as we weed the field, the karma-yogi (skilful worker) gets the idea of removing the weeds of habit and passion from his heart. He concludes that karma-yogi acting thus, through the terms of his own trade or occupation gains knowledge of perfection.

Vikarma - The Key to Karma - Yoga

Chapter IV brings in another new concept of 'Vikanna' or Inward Effort as the key to Yoga of action. Without this key the lock of ultimate purity or self-knowledge will not and cannot open. This state has been defined as 'Desirelessness', It is a quality of mind. As a means of creating this, the pursuit of 'Swadharma' is not enough, other aids are needed. For this, we need to purify the mind. By self-examination, we have to cleanse the mind of its dirt.

When 'Vikarma' or the action of the mind and heart enters into 'Karma' or outward action desirelessness (purity) grows within us little by little. Without inward effort he illustrates a case of social worker like this 'To serve people who are poor or lame or are unhappy and in difficulties and to make them happy is the duty that falls to us in the ordinary course. But we should not conclude, therefore, that all social workers have become karma-yogis. If the attitude of mind (bhavana) in social service is not pure it can become a terrifying thing.

If the outward action is not moistened by the heart's affection then the performance of swadharma would remain barren, it would not bear the flower and the fruit of 'desirelessness'. Moreover, where the heart is not engaged egoism too would show its head. Sick men are usually peevish - and those who nurse them without the true spirit of service will only be disgusted.

When the inner feeling goes with the action, the latter is transformed into something unique. The power that karma develops at the touch of vikarma is indescribable. The infinite power of the practice of swadharma lies latent. Touch it with vikarma, and see what work it can do! In the resulting explosion desire and anger are destroyed, and the way made clear for the attainment of supreme wisdom. When you apply vikarma to karma, the latter begins to acquire divine radiance. The mother strokes her child's back. A hand moves up and down a back, and no more. But who can describe the feelings arising in the hearts of the mother and the child from this commonplace action?

What do we mean by saying that, by pouring vikarma into karma, it becomes akarma. If we mean that, while acting, we seem not to act, we do not feel the burden of action. Though we act, we are not the doer. By vikarma, by inner purity, karma ceases to be karma. An action performed with pure heart does not attach itself to us. It leaves no residue of sin or virtue, paap or punya; else, what a heavy pressure of action would our hearts and minds have to bear! We feel that action crowds in on us from all sides, we feel that it has caught us by the throat. Just as the waves of the sea dash with force against the land and make channels into it, the complexity of action (karma) enters the mind and agitates it. The quality of pleasure and pain, sukh and dukh, develops; all

peace is lost. The action takes place and is over, but its force remains behind. Action corrupts the mind, and destroys sleep.

But if, with karma we combine vikarma, then, however much work you do; you will not feel its strain. The mind becomes still steady and radiant, like the polestar.

Saints, though engaged in a thousand action, do not allow a ripple to arise in the still waters of their mind. One can never understand this miracle until one goes to a saint and sees it. Though surrounded by libraries and reading rooms, man everywhere still remains a monkey without culture or knowledge. Though knowledge spreads so rapidly, how does man's mind manage to remain still empty? One man says that human memory is getting weaker; another, that men are losing the power of concentration. Lord Krishna said to Arjuna, 'You have been listening to so far too may things, and your mind is dazed. Till it gets steady, you will not see the way clearly. Stop reading books and listening to people, and now take sanctuary with the saints. There you can read the book of life. There, silent speech clears all your doubts. By going there you will understand how utterly serene the mind can be while performing continuous service; you will understand how, though action rages without, the heart can be turned to produce unbroken music.

The Two Aspects of Akarma - Yoga And Sanyasa

Vinoba spent several years to absorb this chapter which he considers key to the whole book. Summary of his deep study is the final goal of yoga and Sanyasa 'Action without activity'. These two traditions of spiritual seekers in India - large majority of house-holders engaged in social and economic activity and making themselves fitter for experience by constantly adding inward effort of purity to their external work and a minority group who do not get married and consequently cut themselves off from social and economic activity, get absorbed mainly in inward effort doing minimum external work to keep life going. Both these groups ultimately come to the same result. 'Action without fatigue, without stress with very high value adding power, power which move mountains, revolutionise societies - Power of Buddha, Jesus or Gandhi.'

Although both traditions lead to same result, the path of action is preferred because it is safe. To my mind, the reason why it is safe is that it can be practised successfully from the humblest to the mightiest. Indian History has many actual examples of men who got the results of self-realisation in this way. Potters, weavers, merchants and kings who reached the goal in this way are illustrated in the book. Explaining the beauty and spiritual purpose of action Vinoba explains that external actions reveal the real quality of our minds. He says a man becomes angry because anger was within and external action created circumstances by which it came out. If we do not act, we cannot test our mind that it has anger, jealousy, hatred etc. Our action talks. Our action is a mirror which shows us our true form.

When we act and discover our own defects, we are impelled to employ 'Vikarma' or inward action to remove them. When actions do not distort the mind, when it becomes natural and normal (sahaja), it becomes 'Akarma' - action with intense results.

Example of Sun is taken to illustrate this final result - 'Akarma' - the goal of all spiritual practices. It shines, gives life to the whole world. As sun rises, people get ready for work, birds start coming out of nest, but Sun is just shining, it is normal and natural for Sun to shine. All activity is inspired by his presence but still he is the witness. Doing nothing though doing all things, to do all things by doing nothing, both alike are 'Yoga'. However to reach the goal of doing nothing by doing all things - the path of Karma-Yoga - Yoga of Action is to be preferred, because it is both the way and the goal - where the path ends, goal is there.

There is room in Karma yoga for effort and practice. Through this path of action, one can learn to control the senses little by little. Ease in practice distinguishes 'karma yoga ' or the path of action from 'sanyasa' path of renunciation but in the state of perfection, both are the same. This is 'Akarma ' action without activity.

Controlling the Mind

Concepts like Swadharma (Performing one's duty), Karma (Action), vikarma (Inward action) and Akarma (Stress-less Intense action) having been well explained in the preceding chapters,

Vinoba now turns to the means for attaining this perfect state of action. One of the important tool in this direction is one-pointedness of mind, an integrated state as opposed to fragmented one.

Before explaining the contents of the chapter, Vinoba once again emphasises that Gita is a scripture intended for ordinary men, living daily life in the world. It may be useful to the ascetics but the main thrust of the discourse has common-man in the centre. He says that Gita is prepared to go to the lowest, the weakest, the least cultured of men. And it goes to him not to keep him where he is, but to grasp him by the hand and lift him up.

This Chapter which deals with the technique of meditation, points out three important parameters to obtain the result, one is one-pointedness of mind, second is setting bounds to one's life to achieve this and third is evenness of vision or a state of equanimity. For achieving this we need practice and objective outlook towards family, society, nation and the world. One-pointedness can be achieved by stopping the wheel of thoughts in the mind by coming out of the habit of brooding on trifles. If the mind incessantly (?) keeps on moving, the man's whole strength is lost. There is no kind of discipline. Our actions should be progressively purer by adopting the technique of Karma and Vikarma. To support the concentrated state of mind, he says that 'Let us turn away not only from bad things, but also from excess of even goods things'. Such disciplined conduct is called 'setting bounds to life'. Third parameter is a balanced outlook. So long as we cannot experience that the whole creation is auspicious, the mind will not be one-pointed. As long as we think that some-thing is wrong with the world, we look at all things with suspicion. If one looks at the world with friendly eyes, a perennial stream will spring in the heart, divine stars will shine in the inner firmament.

He sums the chapter by concluding remarks like this - For dhyana-yoga (the way of meditation), it is thus seen that one-pointedness of mind, disciplined living and a friendly and balanced outlook are necessary. Besides these, two other aids, detachment and practice, are mentioned. The first is a negative, destructive method, the other, positive and constructive. To uproot and throw away the weeds from the field is destructive work and this is vairagya detachment. To sow seeds in the field is constructive

work. To think good thoughts again and again is abhyasa - practice. Yairagya is negative, abhyasa is positive.

Surrender to God

Although Vinoba has given this name to the chapter, as I studied Talks on the Gita, I was tempted to give another name 'Bhakti' or Devotion re-defined'. To understand why I reached this conclusion, let us have a look at India of 1932.

India like many other Christian countries had well-defined system of temple worship with its attendant rituals. In the early part of this century these practices had been monopolized by high class Hindus and their priests. All poor and low class Indians were not allowed entry into temples. This was done in the name of preserving the sanctity of the religion. Whereas majority of Indians did not have one square meal to eat, leave alone clothes and other amenities, this minority used to spend many hours in the worship, arrange sumptuous feasts for their caste bretheren and were providing for the indulgent and luxurious standard of living of the priest. All this went in the name of surrender to God or Bhakti.

In contrast to this and from the actual text Vinoba deals with common manifestations of life and interprets them as the play of Divine. He says the anger of the angry man, the love of the lover, the agony of the sufferer, happiness of the happy one, the drowsiness of the idler, the activity of the worker, all these have an in-built divinity in them. He shows that man's pleasure hunt is because there is no joy in his life and this condition in turn is because he is unable to experience divinity in ordinary things of-life as taught by Gita. Once we have seen the true nature of the universe and tasted its joy, we shall find these other pleasures insipid.

The best way to discover this joy is 'Bhakti' or Devotion. Even if we have to beg, there is greatness in begging from the God rather than from the world and this begging is Bhakti. Citing his own version of Devotion he says, 'If on seeing the great rivers, if one can feel the river as compassion of God flowing before us, such a man is a true devotee'. If man's heart-beat leaps at the sight of the rain-bow, dances at the sight of the daffodils, he is a true

devotee. It starts with desire or 'Sakam Bhakti' and ends with joy without external stimulation which Gita calls 'Nishkam Bhakti ' or end of ail material desires.

Describing three kinds of Bhaktas, Gita says first kind looks at the whole world through eyes of love, the second kind through the eye of discovery, and the third from the point of view of the world's welfare. There is also a fourth type of perfect devotee. His method is to see God in the ugly as in the handsome, in the beggar as in the king, in men, women, animals and birds, everywhere he sees the presence of God. This pure devotee sees the grandeur of God in majestic ocean, the mother like tenderness of God in cow, in the earth he sees His presence, in the clear sky His purity, in Sun, Moon and Stars, His brightness and beauty, His softness in flowers, and in the evil man the God who tests and tries us. Thus he practices the art of seeing the one God at play everywhere and in doing so, one day the seer-saint merges into the Lord. This was what Vinoba understood as Devotion with all its variegated tools and this is the result of surrendering one's Ego to God.

Achieving the Goal

For my own purpose, I gave the name 'Sanskar Mukti' to this chapter i.e. Freedom from good as well as bad tendencies, so that pure existence can be experienced. It is this purity of existence which can get in tune with God during and at the end of the life. 'Eating, drinking, sitting, sleeping, wandering, a little work...likes and dislikes, honour and dishonour, pain and pleasure in endless variety! And they all leave associations, impacts and build up tendencies in the mind. Hence if someone asks me, what life is, I should explain it as an aggregate of 'Sanskaras' or tendencies.

Important and distinct actions leave a deep impression on the mind; other actions fade away from memory. However, a single powerful 'sanskara' alone remains at last as the essential thing. All the efforts of life should be guided by the idea that this final fruit should be full of sweetness, that the last moment should be blissful. When the end is sweet, all else is sweet.

In order to achieve this, we should aim to conquer the fear of death. Thinking of death - not brooding over it - is a means of avoiding sin. With constant awareness of death, with what

strength can man commit sin? Man has become so frightened of death that he cannot bear ever the thought of it. Only thing which consoles us for our miseries is diversion, and yet this is the greatest of our miseries. For it is this which makes us ruin ourselves. Diversion amuses us and leads us unconsciously to death.

Therefore remembering that death is the crown of life, we should constantly practice the means by which we can make our last moments holy, pure and sweet. To create such good 'sanskara', let noble thoughts course through the mind. Let the hands be busy doing deeds of goodness. Thoughts of God within, and the performance of Swadharma without, these should go on constantly. When the hands perform acts of service till the last breath, the full moon of Bhavana shines brightly, the mind's sky is free from desire, and the intellect is bright and keen - when a man dies in this state, we may take it that he has merged in God. In order to make such an auspicious ending, one must watch day and night and wage skilful war. Not even for an instant, should an evil tendency be permitted in the mind. And in order to gain strength necessary for this, one should remember His name, and meditate on His truth.

The Yoga of Dedication

In this chapter is described the rare power of the name of God. There is an art in chanting this name and experience gained thereby is beyond words and that is why it is sweet. Though this knowledge is a hidden secret, Lord Krishna opens it out for all to understand with ease.

The Gita is the twice-distilled essence of the Vedic Dharma and the name of the Lord is the essence of the Vedas. It is certain that through 'Ramnama ' one can attain 'moksha ' which means that moksha becomes easy for women, children, the rustic and the poor, the weak, sick, lame and indeed for everyone. In whatever action, the man is engaged, through that natural action alone he is able to reach supreme by considering every human form as manifestation of God - such is this method. Another aspect is to dedicate whatever we do to him. Relate to him every act of yours.

There is no question of fitness - no pre-qualification. Any body who does this with pure heart gets the result. When learned

men who say 'I'.'I' are left behind, innocent and devout women go forward. When the mind is pure and heart full of simplicity and holiness, moksha or liberation is not difficult to attain. If the action is filled with pure 'bhavana ', with the attitude of service, it becomes 'yagna'-dedication.

The essence of practice is to dissolve our Ego at the feet of the Lord by dedicating our base tendencies like lust, greed, anger etc. with sincere heart and we become pure as a result. Our senses are no longer our enemies. Their power for good is boundless. Therefore the best and the noblest way to use every one of the senses with the intellect surrendered to the Lord. This is called 'Raja-Yoga'.

How pure and holy the food will be when it is cooked with the 'bhavana' of pleasing the Lord. The moments of our daily life may appear commonplace, but in reality they are not so, they carry enormous significance. Life is dark, ugly and ill of sorrow. But just for a while, let the mind consider that all our actions are for the sake of the Lord. Then we will realise how full of beauty and value our lives become. Do not say what good can the word 'Rama' do. Just try saying it and see what happens.

Creation is but a mirror. What you are and what you bring to this mirror, the image of this, you see in this world. Therefore approach all creation with the feeling that it is good - that it is pure. Carry the same 'attitude' to all your ordinary actions. Then you will see a miraculous change. If you have the 'bhavana ' that Lord is always by your side, then you His servant will know no fear even if the whole world turns up-side down. Therefore turn your heart towards God. Attain his grace. Dedicate all actions to Him. Become altogether His. If you strengthen the attitude that all actions should be offered upto the Lord, this sordid life will become divine, the commonplace will become beautiful. Such actions are not illogical but beyond logic. Where logic ends, spirituality begins.

Looking for God

Life as it is today, our best brains are busy in creating food for all because many lack even food. In such strange times, something as simple as dedication to the Lord becomes difficult.

In this situation, Vinoba takes the example of child learning alphabet - Big letters first and as the practice develops make the same letters small and recognise them. Alternatively easy letters first and complex after a little practice.

The immense being which we see in the ocean is also present in the little drop of water. God who is in 'Rama' is also in 'Ravana', what is found in the gross is present in the subtle. What is found in the simple, is also in the complex. This vast creation is God's book. In this book of creation, God is written down everywhere in beautiful letters. But we do not understand it. It is this sick mind that stands as an obstacle to our seeing God. It is essential to get rid of this state of mind.

Hence because our minds are sick, let us experience God in our father, mother, Guru, a saint, pure children like Dhruva and Prahalada. After one learns to see God in serene and holy human forms, then we turn our eyes to sublime and beautiful aspects of nature. Beauty of sunrise and sunset, this art divine - lovely and majestic waters of Ganges which carries away in her course all the uncleanliness of our mind and body, wind the messenger of God whispering in our heart, fire which burns our impurities etc. We now look to God in creatures, cow full of tenderness and love, the swiftness of horse, majesty of lion, cleanliness of serpent.

Now turn to couples - love of father and son, mother and child, love of brothers, love of husband and wife, love between Rama and monkeys 'Nara and Vanara'. Then the birds majestic peacock with thousand eyes and many coloured brightness in its feather, sweet melodious voice of cuckoo and great municipal service of nature in crow. We just think of fables of Aesop based on child's lively interest in objects of creation. In it, foxes, dogs, crows, deer, hares, tortoise, snakes, worms all talk and laugh.

The truth of the matter is that God is present in all the forms of creation. As holy rivers, mighty mountains, the majestic ocean, the tender-hearted cow, the noble steed, the magnificent lion, the sweet voiced cuckoo, the beautiful peacock, the pure hermit snake, the crow flapping its wings, the restless flame, the still stars - in all this; He is present. Gross and subtle, pure and mixed simple and complex - learn all this and realise in the end that there is no place where God is not. In every atom, He alone is present.

From the ant to the universe, He spreads. The Lord who cares equally for all, the compassionate one who is all knowledge, tenderness, skill, holiness and beauty - He stands on all sides everywhere.

The Vision of the Cosmic Form

In this chapter the Lord reveals His visible form and so His Grace. Arjuna said "Lord, I wish behold with these eyes your complete form, the form in which is manifest all the power of your glory, what he really prayed for was the vision of cosmic form was to see all at once the Omnipresent Lord, who pervaded all time past, present and future and all space here, above, below and everywhere.

Vinoba says verses describing the cosmic form of God cannot be commented. We can only recite the verses describing it and cleanse the mind of sin, purify it only at one point Lords tells Arjuna that this cosmic form cannot be grasped permanently until you dissolve the Ego and become the instrument in the hands of God for all your actions.

To achieve this, the qualifying characteristics are : "He who bears enmity towards none, he who stands impartial and is free from attachment, and serves me selflessly, he who dedicates to me all that he does, he who is filled with devotion to me, all enduring, free of passion and desire, full of love, such a devotee becomes an instrument in the hands of the Lord, This is the essence of Gita's teaching."

Devotion with and without Form

In this chapter, Arjuna asks the question that there are two types of devotees - one who worship the image to grasp and experience spiritual thought and the other grasp the thought directly and act accordingly in search of an experience. Which of the two is better? Vinobaji says that question of Arjuna is similar to asking the mother - which of your two sons are dearer to you? What can the poor mother reply? If at all a reply is pressed for, she would say the younger son because he needs the presence of mother more than the elder one. Similar answer is given by Shri Krishna that if at all answer is needed, one with form is closer to me.

Vinobaji has illustrated this answer by referring to the famous epic 'Ramayana'. When Rama is going to the forest for fourteen years, his younger brother Laxman pleads that he too wants to accompany him. When Rama disuades him not to do so by an argument, Laxmana puts stop to the argument like this 'O Rama I have grown up nourished by your love. I am only a child. I cannot bear the burden of living here without you.' He accompanies Rama for 14 years. This is worship with form or image.

However, Tulsidasji describes that when Rama left for forest, Bharat his other younger brother was not in Ayodhya. When he reached home, his father had died and Royal Guru Vashishtha advises him to assume the rule of the state. But Bharata answers that 'first I must see Rama before I decide this question. He makes arrangements for running the administration. His line of thinking is 'Kingdom belongs to Rama. To arrange for the administration is like doing Rama's work. Devotion to Rama means carrying out his work; else what good is the devotion? This is the devotion without form.

This classical example of Formless Devotion ends with following dialogue between the brothers Bharat says, 'Rama my Lord, I shall humbly do your bidding. Whatever you say, r shall not doubt or question. But as he prepares to leave, he turns to Rama and says, Sir, my heart is yet unreconciled. I feel as if I have lost something. 'Rama at once understood his yearning and gave him one of his personal effects as symbol in place of Rama. Though Bharata was firm in his loyalty to duty and principle, he too needed the living warmth of the symbol. This is Devotion without Form.

The chapter ends with following words from Shree Krishna 'Arjuna, it does not matter whether you are devotee with or without form. More important is to become a devotee with all your heart.

The Self and the Non-self

Here the most important aid to Swadharma - a discriminating insight - to separate the bran from the wheat or smelting gold from the ore - is discussed and the steps are shown how to get the gold and remove the impurities. For this Vinoba gives the example of Coconut where the hard exterior shell is to be broken to reach and taste the pulp. Similarly to taste the sweet juicy pulp of jack-fruit, the rough sharp exterior has to be carefully removed.

There is a clear message here for inward journey. One must understand that 'I' am altogether distinct from the body, separate entirely beautiful, bright, holy and free from even a trace of imperfection. As we proceed inward the self illuminates the body and puts joy, power, fearlessness self-control etc. As we move inwards, attachment to the body slowly decreases, one experiences genuine freedom and power. No true safety is possible so long as there is attachment to body and consequent fear.

In this inward journey, we progressively experience God - first as an impartial witness. When the life of morality begins, He encourages us when good things take place through us. During further inward journey. When the devotee discovers that his own efforts are inadequate to cleanse the subtle impurities of his mind, when he is on the point of break-down, He becomes the Helper of the helpless and rushes to his aid. After that we see that He also is the enjoyer of the fruit of action. His presence only makes us experience the sweetness of the fruit. From this point we start experiencing our divinity. When our ego surrenders totally to the inner self- the inner master - we reach the ultimate goal. During this long, arduous, at times risky and dangerous inner journey, the tools which are helpful and therefore essential are action and devotion ultimately blending into action with devotion.

Vinoba says to achieve this firm foundation of morality is indispensable. We should discriminate between essential and non-essential and hold fast to the essential. This discriminating experience which is called 'jnana' or realisation should pervade every fibre of our body. It should flow through one's heart. It should express itself through the hands and the feet, the eyes and the ears. One should attain a state when all the organs of perception and action work with this consciousness. Out symptoms of this realisation have been narrated by twenty virtues like humility, sincerity, non-violence, straightforwardness, forgiveness etc. The substance is that we should make our lives grow more and more by distinguishing the body from the spirit and thus feel ourselves with the presence of God.

Building-up and Breaking-down

This chapter is essentially a supplement to thirteenth, Self and the Non-self. Here, there is an analysis of non-self. Entire material body including mind-intellect consciousness and ego-system consists of subtle particles and electrical charges broadly divided into Gross called Tamas. Subtle called - Rajas and subtler one called sattva or pure manifestation. These three modes of nature are called Gunas.

Chief characteristic of Tamas is Laziness - inability to do anything fruitful. It is an enemy which destroys peace and happiness of individual and society. It corrupts every one from the lowest to the highest. When the body is lazy, the mind and the intellect are lazy too. Under the effect of Tamas (Laziness), men grow rusty and useless; the limbs and senses of the rich are eaten with rust because they are never used.

Educated and intelligent men become victims of various diseases because under the effect of Tamas, they never do any physical work To shake off laziness, one must perform bodily labour. This is the only way to conquer laziness. If we fail to do this, we cannot but receive due punishment from Nature. We have to endure it in the form of sickness and other miseries. The time spent on the bodily labour is not wasted. It does yield result. We have sound health. Our minds become bright and keen and pure This is one of the methods to overcome the Tamas or Laziness.

Chief characteristic of Rajas or hyper-activity is desire to do all sorts of things - a limitless desire for action with all consuming greed. As a result, we are unable to control the rush of our instincts and passions. Another sign of Rajas is absence of steadiness. The man of Rajas is ever busy taking up and abandoning things. All actions under its effect are restless and uncertain. The way to come out of restlessness is to combine action with inward effort. This results in inner purity. Keep on acting constantly and surrender the fruit of action to God. Acting this way, slowly Rajas is destroyed. It is necessary to destroy this demon of every rising greed and desires. This is the Karma-yoga of Gita.

If these two are conquered, we are left with Satva or a pure state of our existence - peaceful and bright, full of creative energy.

However, even this is to be conquered not by killing but by wounding. Constantly making an effort to remain in this state, it becomes our nature to remain pure. Pride of purity slowly goes away. Any negligence by the seeker due to pride in this state, is likely to drag him down to the state of hyper-activity and further down to laziness. Constant vigilance till it becomes our nature to remain pure is an absolute necessity of this state.

Thereafter, the seeker tries to cross-over the material self consisting of all these three modifications. The tool here is to seek His grace with all the heart. It does come. Having reached this state, no further effort is required to remain pure.

Completeness of Vision

In this chapter, all the ideas of the Gita find their fulfilment. Shri Krishna calls this particular Chapter 'Shashtra '- a scripture because in this chapter science and philosophy of life that have been taught till now find completion. The function of Vedas is to awaken in man awareness of his own power to know everything, guide everything. This is called 'Parmartha : Because this is done in this chapter it has been called 'Yedasaara' the essence of the Veda

In the last chapter, Shri Krishna says that for Self-realisation, Bhakti is the ultimate tool; without it realisation is not possible. This chapter starts with the description of the world as mighty tree with huge branches nourished by three 'gunas'. This tree is to be cut with the axe of desirelessness and detachment. With Bhakti or devotion this effort becomes easy. This devotion is a blend of action, love, and knowledge. All difficulties on the path of realisation get converted to pleasure with the touch of this devotion.

Differentiated concept of Purushottama - the Supreme Self which Sri Krishna is, the individual self which is non-perishable and has to be realised and tools of Bhakti or devotion which are perishable are dealt with here. There is deep significance in the perishable nature of the tools. This is not the fault of the creation; it is its glory. Because of this, creation is ever new. Yesterday's flowers will not do for to-day's worship. New flowers are required and are available. In the same way new bodies will be provided

every now and then to give freshness and life to the worship. Because the body is transient, it is beautiful. Because the instruments are ever new, the enthusiasm for worship grows; the habit of service develops. This is the essence of 'Bhakti ' or devotion.

This conceptual reality of Purushottama or Supreme Self to whom our ego can surrender so that purusha or self within us can awaken and ultimately be realised. The ever new, ever changing tool of worship is a necessity from the beginning to the end of the path. However worship does not mean only offering flowers and consecrated rice or Vermillion (Kumkum). This is there but it is to be supported by our day-to-day actions. To keep house-hold utensils clean and polished is a worship. To clean a lamp is also a worship. To whet the scythe and make it ready for reaping is a worship.

To lubricate the rusty hinge of the door, this is worship too. All our actions from morning to evening - all are worship of the God. To a king of scriptures like Gita, a daily half our worship or puja yields no satisfaction. Its keen desire is that the whole of life should be filled with the Lord and be a form worship. And this worship is to surrender our 'I' at the feet of Supreme reality 'Purshottama ' so that we ultimately transform ourselves from perishable to imperishable 'Self- the 'Purusha'.

The Conflict between Divine and Demon

Fifteenth chapter completes the purpose of Gita i.e., how to come out of human weaknesses, establish firm support by worshiping ashtadeva or Purushottama and that by offering ever changing ever new modes of worship. However, before the sun rises, light starts spreading, similarly a little before the seeker starts on the path the dawn of good qualities starts shining.

This chapter describes the qualities needed to be perfected in the life of accomplished seeker and also describes the darkness with which seeker has to fight before getting established. In essence it describes the conflict between the divine and the demonic qualities. Kurukshetra is both outside us and within us. When we observe it carefully, it is the battle raging within that we see assuming shape in the world without. To speak the truth, the battle is only within ourselves.

As there are good qualities on one side and bad qualities on the other, both the armies are well arranged. Commander of good qualities is 'abhaya' or fearlessness. Fearlessness has been given first place in a long list of twenty-six qualities. This is not an accident. In a atmosphere charged with fear, good qualities cannot grow. While in front fearlessness stands alert, humility guards the rear. This is an excellent arrangement. If we have first twenty five qualities mentioned in this chapter but no humility, 'ahamkar' or Ego principle will attack the army from the back and destroy it. In the absence of humility, there is no knowing when victory will turn into defeat, other qualities between fearlessness and humility are compassion, tenderness, forgiveness, serenity, patience, non-violence, loyalty etc.

On the other side, there is an army of ignorance, vanity, power and wealth. Under the effect of these negative qualities, one says that 'I am the only person fit to hold all the wealth of the world. The whole world should come under my control'. Desire, anger and greed are the sources from where negative qualities multiply. Way out is the control of the senses. This is the path laid down by 'Shashtras'. 'Shashtras' are made up of the experience of the saints gained through their efforts. Hence to overcome negativities, 'Self-control' as advised by 'Shashtras' is inevitable.

Waging this incessant war between divine and demonic qualities, there may be temporary defeats in the battle but in the end, war is won by the divine qualities. Hence doing good to the world is to show the man-kind the pure and beautiful path of virtue. Thus demonstrating victory of divine over the evil forces.

Programme for the Seeker

Vinoba says that only when our life proceeds within bounds and in a accepted, disciplined way that the mind can be free. The Sun is free and independent. He is regular. It is in this regularity that the essence of his freedom lies. Hence in this chapter Shri Krishna sets down a programme of action.

The programme of Yagna (Regeneration), Dana (Sharing with society) & Tapa (purification of body and mind) is described as the debt to the nature. Nature is pure and it is polluted by human

beings; hence we have to regenerate by yagna (Regeneration). Regeneration is to replenish loss, and to purify things. Society has supported a part of our existence; we have to repay the debt. Dana (Charity) for various social purposes is repaying the debt. Rays of Sun in summer destroy a plenty of morbid matter on the earth and purify saline water of the sea to provide sweet water through rain. This is tapa which is also yagna or regeneration by removing or destroying impurities.

In fact three orders of nature, society and the body are not distinct. Society is not outside creation and not so the body. The creative effort we make, charity we give and japas we perform, all these can be called Yagna in the comprehensive sense. There is no question of receiving any fruit because we have already received this. What we have taken, we must now return. Through yagna (regeneration), we maintain equilibrium in nature, through dana (charity) in society and tapa (purification) in the body. Again Yagna, Dana and Tapa are divided into 'Satvik', Rajasik and Tamasik. If there is expectation of fruit in Yagna it is Rajavik; if it is fruitless it is Tamasik. Disorderly actions become lifeless. Into such actions Tamas enters. Through it, no noble thing can be created. From it no fruit will grow. Even though there is no desire for fruit in performing 'yagna', it ought to yield noble fruit.

In this way, fruitful action purifies our mind and heart, same classification applies to Dana (charity) and Tapa (purity). When it is fruitful, it leads to Beauty & Grace which is the result of purity.

Grace of God

After the sermon in the fifteenth chapter, no new concepts are introduced. Sixteenth and Seventeenth chapter details the inner fight and the programme for the seeker. In this chapter, whatever we have learnt is being concluded.

First thing we learnt in Gita is that we have to act - keep on acting but surrender the fruit of our actions to God. These actions are of three types Satvic - which bring noble fruit, Rajasic - which gives mixed fruit of pleasure and pain, and Tamasic or fruitless activity / activity which bears painful fruit. Out of this, Shri Krishna advises that fruitless activity should be totally curbed and

mixed fruit activity to be progressively purified by surrendering its fruit to God.

Resultant Satvic activity has also some defects, but this should not be given up. As inward purity grows, the effort in the action becomes less. From effort to gentleness, from gentleness to subtlety, from subtlety to nothingness, the activity tends to zero and action towards infinity.

After having said this, Sri Krishna tells Arjuna, You have heard with attention, all that I have been saying. Consider my words fully and do what you think right'. Thus Shri Krishna generously sets Arjuna free. In the same breath, in the next verse he says, 'Arjuna, give up everything and take refuge in Me'. What does this mean? It means as long as there is Ego, there is danger in becoming free; let not any desire of your own arise in your heart. Be an observer of all the waves of desire. 'Not my, but HIS Will' - 'Not my but His Will'. "I" am not, "He" is. As you learn to subdue your ego thus, your 'Rajsik action ill become pure and what will be left will be infinite action without the 'doer'. Every action coming from God - making one a vehicle of His 'divine will' No 'I', No 'My' - all His. Starting with 'I' and frustration leading to no activity in the first chapter to destroying the illusion of 'I' in the second chapter, Gita progresses to the way of action, inward action to support outward action, leading to state of egoless activity in fifth chapter. Rest of the chapters mention the tools of concentration, devotion, surrender, cosmic vision etc. to support egoless activity, and last comes total surrender to obtain His Grace which is the final tool. 'His grace having been established, no effort is needed to remain pure. Purity becomes not only our second nature, but it becomes our first nature, our nature itself. This is the aim and end of Bhagvat-Gita.

FAMOUS QUOTES

A country should be defended not by arms, but by ethical behavior.

All revolutions are spiritual at the source. All my activities have the sole purpose of achieving a union of hearts.

Do not allow yourself to imagine that revolutionary thinking can be propagated by governmental power.

Human life is full of the play of samskaras - tendencies developed by repeated actions.

I cannot bear to see karma, jnana and bhakti separated. To some seekers established in karma, this is the only thing that appears worth-while.

If a man achieves victory over this body, who in the world can exercise power over him? He who rules himself rules over the whole world.

If we could only snap the fetters of the body that bind the feet of the soul, we shall experience a great joy. Then we shall not be miserable because of the body's sufferings. We shall become free.

If we wish our nature to be free and joyous, we should bring our activities into same order.

In nonviolence you must go full steam ahead, if you want the good to come speedily you must go about it with vigor.

In the Bhagavad Gita, there is no long discussion, nothing elaborate. The main reason for this is that everything stated in the Gita is meant to be tested in the life of every man; it is intended to be verified in practice.

In the mind of man and in society which is its image, a great war rages between two attitudes, two ways of living, two sets of qualities.

In this world of chance and change and mutability, the fulfillment of any resolve depends on the will of the Lord.

Innumerable actions are going on through us all the time. If we started counting them, we should never come to an end.

It is a curious phenomena that God has made the hearts of the poor, rich and those of the rich, poor.

It is only when our life proceeds within bounds and in an accepted, disciplined way, that the mind can be free.

Life does not mean mere karma or mere bhakti or mere jnana.

The main reason why we look constantly to the Gita is that, whenever we need help, we may get it from the Gita. And, indeed, we always do get it.

The natural movement of one's soul is upwards. But just as any object is dragged down when a heavy weight is tied to it, the burden of the body drags down the soul.

The river flows at its own sweet will, but the flood is bound in the two banks. If it were not thus bound, its freedom would be wasted.

Though the names karma yoga and sannyasa are different, the truth at the heart of both is the same.

We cannot even recollect the actions of our infancy, our childhood is like something written on a slate and rubbed off.

We cannot fight new wars with old weapons.

We have seen from experience that, if we are in the habit of walking regularly on the same road, we are able to think about other things while walking, without paying attention to our steps.

What we should aim at is the creation of people power, which is opposed to the power of violence and is different from the coercive power of state.

When a thing is true, there is no need to use any arguments to substantiate it.

9

Dr. Zakir Hussain

Dr Hussain, whose birth anniversary falls on February 8th, symbolised the quintessential values enshrined in the composite culture of India in all its variety and splendour. His resounding success in the election which catapulted him to the presidency in 1967, was a telling testimony to the endearing qualities embodied in him. His opponent was a Hindu and the electoral base of the Congress party, which had nominated him, had shrunk alarmingly. Dr Hussain was President of India from May 13, 1967, to May 3, 1969, the day he died in harness.

CHILDHOOD

He was born in Hyderabad (in Sind). His Pakhtun father had migrated to Hyderabad from Qaingay in 1908. Then, Dr Hussain was sent to a residential school in Etawah named Islamia High School. In 1913, he joined the Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental college (which later on became the Aligarh Muslim University, AMU), where he was a student leader.

He served as the Vice-President of the students union and distinguished himself as an excellent debater. While in Aligarh, he wrote an essay, which demonstrated his nationalist fervour, aimed at liquidating the belief held by many Muslims that the community would benefit by supporting the British rule in India.

In 1920, he responded to the Non-cooperation call from Mahatma Gandhi and left the college to actively involve in the freedom movement. Dr Hussain was among the small group of students and teachers who founded a National Muslim University and named it Jamia Millia Islamia. Jamia represented the first

concrete manifestation of Hindu-Muslim collaboration and realisation of the Gandhian dream of national centre for learning.

He braved great odds to keep this institution alive and made it grow into a centre of excellence. After his long innings in the Jamia, he became the Vice-Chancellor of AMU from where he went on to become the Governor of Bihar. He served as the Vice-President of India from 1962 to 67.

It is universally acknowledged that Dr Hussain was one of the most creative educational thinkers of 20th century India. The educational philosophy and principles designed by him constituted the confluence of three streams of educational thought: one coming from Germany propounded by the legendary educationist Kerschen Sterner, the other from John Dewey, the most eminent educationist of America and the third from the ideas of Mahatma Gandhi.

It can hardly be gainsaid that education can transform an individual into consummate, civilised being. But such a transformation can be effected only by a "good teacher". Dr Hussain's vision runs counter to the prevailing blatant commercialisation of education and the teaching profession. Apart from deep knowledge of the subjects that a teacher should be teaching, he believed, he or she should be imbued with lofty moral values and should be able to inculcate among the children, the idea of excellence.

His name is intimately associated with the concept of basic education, popularly known as the Wardha scheme. This system was inspired by Gandhiji's ideal of education by which he meant training of mind, body and soul which meant the usage of head, hand and heart. His formula of the three "Hs," standing for head, heart and hands visualised a complete human being: Training of the head was through books, of hand through craft and of the heart through cultural goods.

THE ESSENCE

For the nourishment of the mental faculty, there should necessarily be sustained supply of fine cultural goods by which he meant understanding and appreciating legacies from the past

in the realms of art, literature, philosophy, religions, music, morals and crafts. This may be the vision of an integrated personality.

Wardha Scheme did not find many takers at the national level and was not introduced in a larger level, though Dr Hussain experimented with it in Jamia, making the "activity school" come alive and worthy of emulation. Three of its ideas bear contemporary relevance and continue to remain as unfulfilled objectives: the idea of compulsory education, vocational training and medium of instruction.

If India had accepted and applied this scheme it would have been a perfect panacea for many educational ills of our country.

Dr. Zakir Husain represented the mainstream vision of India's freedom movement which saw the future of independent India as being secured only on the foundations of secular democracy and economic and intellectual self-reliance. In his Pledge to the Nation on assuming office as the President of India, he encapsulates this vision. India, he says, is a "young state of an ancient people who, through the long millennia and through the cooperation of diverse ethnic elements, have striven to realise timeless, absolute values in their own peculiar way……I, therefore, pledge myself to the totality of our past culture from wheresoever it may have come and by whomsoever it may have been contributed. I pledge myself, to the service of the totality of my country's culture, I pledge my loyalty to my country, irrespective of region or language; I pledge myself to work for its strength and progress and for the welfare of its people without distinction of caste, colour or creed. The whole of Bharat is my Home and its people are my family. The people have chosen to make me the Head of this family for a certain time. It shall be my earnest endeavour to seek to make this Home strong and beautiful, a worthy Home for a great people engaged in the fascinating tasks of building up a just and prosperous and graceful life………..The situation demands of us work, work and more work, silent and sincere work, solid and steady reconstruction of the whole material and cultural life of our people.

"This work, as I see it, has two aspects: work on one's self and work for the society around. They are mutually fruitful aspects of work. The work on one's self is to follow the urge towards

moral development as free persons under self-imposed discipline, which alone can render that development possible. Its end-product is a free moral personality. We can neglect this end-product only at our peril."

It is with great pain that we must realise that over this half century since independence, it is this `end-product' that has not only been neglected but has seen a steady degeneration. The recent Tehelka exposures have shocked the country baring the depths to which moral degeneration has sunk. We shall return to this later.

Dr. Zakir Husain had quoted Rabindranath Tagore to buttress his vision. I would only like to recollect what Firaq Gorakhpuri had once said:

"Haasil-e-Husn-o-Ishq Bas Itna,

Admi Admi Ko Pahechane"

(The ultimate objective of beauty and love is merely that man should understand man).

Alas! In the society all around us, it is precisely this which appears missing! The most unfortunate aspect is that this is happening in the name of religion!

This vision represented by Dr. Zakir Husain was, in fact, an integral part of the ideological battle that continued through the freedom struggle and, in a way, continues even today between three distinct vision of what should constitute the character of independent India. Opposed to the mainstream vision of the freedom movement which created the Indian Republic on the foundations of secular democracy was the myopic inward looking vision of converting independent India into a rabidly intolerant "Hindu Rashtra". This vision originates with the formation of the RSS in 1925. This was best articulated by M.S. Golwalkar, RSS Sarsanghchalak, in 1939; in his, by now infamous book, "We or our Nationhood defined".

"The conclusion is unquestionably forced upon us that…..in Hindusthan exists and must needs exist the ancient Hindu nation and nought else but the Hindu Nation. All those not belonging to the national, ie, Hindu Race, Religion, Culture and Language naturally fall out of the pale of real `National' life.

"We repeat: in Hindusthan, the land of the Hindus, lives and should live the Hindu Nation - satisfying all the five essential requirements of the scientific nation concept of the modern world. Consequently only those movements are truly `National' as aim at re-building, re-vitalising and emancipating from its present stupor, the Hindu Nation. Those only are nationalist patriots, who, with the aspiration to glorify the Hindu race and nation next to their heart, are prompted into activity and strive to achieve that goal. All others are either traitors and enemies to the National cause, or, to take a charitable view, idiots" (Golwalkar, 1939, pp. 43-44). He continues: "We must bear in mind that so far as `nation' is concerned, all those, who fall outside the five-fold limits of that idea, can have no place in the national life, unless they abandon their differences, adopt the religion, culture and language of the Nation and completely merge themselves in the National Race. So long, however, as they maintain their racial, religious and cultural differences, they cannot but be only foreigners"(Golwalkar, 1939, p. 45).

And further: "There are only two courses open to the foreign elements, either to merge themselves in the national race and adopt its culture, or to live at its mercy so long as the national race may allow them to do so and to quit the country at the sweet will of the national race …..From this standpoint, sanctioned by the experience of shrewd old nations, the foreign races in Hindusthan must either adopt the Hindu culture and language, must learn to respect and hold in reverence Hindu religion, must entertain no idea but those of the glorification of the Hindu race and culture, ie, of the Hindu nation and must lose their separate existence to merge in the Hindu race, or may stay in the country, wholly subordinated to the Hindu Nation, claiming nothing, deserving no privileges, far less any preferential treatment - not even citizen's rights.

There is, at least should be, no other course for them to adopt. We are an old nation; let us deal, as old nations ought to and do deal, with the foreign races, who have chosen to live in our country." (Golwalkar, 1939, pp. 47-48)

In contrast to the mainstream vision and uncompromisingly opposed to the vision of "Hindu Rashtra" was the Left vision

which sought to build on the mainstream vision and transform the political content of the Republic into the economic empowerment of the Indian people. The socialist vision, therefore, while not opposing the mainstream vision was critical of its limitations and continues till today to convert the political independence of our country into the economic independence of our people.

The conflicts that we see in present-day politics is essentially an expression of this battle of ideas in contemporary conditions.

In pursuance of its narrow exclusivist intolerant communal agenda, the proponents of "Hindu Rashtra" had not only distanced themselves from the united struggle of the Indian people (belonging to all religions and nationalities), but objectively acted as agents of the British rule.

What is little known is the fact that the uncontested hero of the Saffron brigade today, V.D. Savarkar, known as "Veer" Savarkar in RSS folklore, gave a mercy petition to the British on November 14, 1913 seeking his release from the cellular jail in the Andamans. This surrender made him a public ally of the British policy of divide and rule. It must be recalled that the term `Hindutva' was coined by Savarkar.

In his petition, he assures the British: ``Now no man having the good of India and humanity at heart will blindly step on the thorny paths which in the excited and hopeless situation of India in 1906-1907 beguiled us from the path of peace and progress. Therefore if the Government in their manifold beneficence and mercy, release me I for one cannot but be the staunchest advocate of constitutional progress and loyalty to the English government which is the foremost condition of that progress." (R.C.Majumdar, `Penal Settlement in Andamans', pp 211-213)

Further in a letter to British authorities, he wrote: "I hereby acknowledge that I had a fair trial and just sentence. I heartily abhor methods of violence resorted to in days gone by and I feel myself duty bound to uphold law and constitution to the best of my powers and am willing to make the reform a success insofar as I may be allowed to do so in future". (A facsimile of this letter was published in Frontline, April 7, 1995, p. 94)

He proudly subscribed to the two-nation theory in its fullest sense. In his presidential address to the Hindu Mahasabha in December 1939, Savarkar declared: "We Hindus are a nation by ourselves ... we Hindus are marked out as an abiding Nation by ourselves" (see Indian Annual Register, 1939, Vol II). Again later he reiterated, "I have no quarrel with Mr Jinnah's two-nation theory. We, Hindus, are a nation by ourselves and it is a historical fact that Hindus and Muslims are two nations" (Indian Annual Register, 1943, Vol II).

For the major portion of his life after making peace with the British his politics was oppositional to the Congress and the Left led movements rather than the British. As leader of the Hindu Mahasabha, he made sure that movements like the Quit India movement of 1942 passed without any participation from members of the Hindu Mahasabha or the Sanghathanists. He categorically called on the Hindus to give no support to the movement' (see Amba Prasad, The Indian Revolt of 1942).

"I issue this definite instruction that all Hindu Sanghathanists in general holding any post or position of vantage in the government services should stick to them and continue to perform their regular duties" (Quoted in Noorani, Frontline, December 1, 1995).

Overcoming the assault of such forces, the Indian people at the time of independence embraced secular democracy as the foundations of the new Indian Republic. It was for this very reason that the tallest of Indian leaders, Mahatma Gandhi, was assassinated by these elements.

Secular democracy is the only political basis for keeping a country of such diversity and plurality united. This was accepted once as a statement of fact. Today it is coming under severe attack. In that sense, the battle of visions that took place during the freedom struggle continues even today.

Secularism is not a western concept, as alleged by the RSS, embraced by independent India. Its foundations can be traced back to the Ashokan inscriptions on his famous pillars that continue to exist all over the country. In fact, in one of them, it is precisely stated that it shall be State's responsibility to protect the choice of faith of every individual. This was in third century B.C. Tolerance as State policy was necessary in India not only because of religious diversity. It is necessary also because of the vast array of diversity that exists in terms of language, cultures, traditions etc. A definition of secularism, which is the most appropriate in the Indian context, is, thus, not confined only to the issue of separation of religion from the State and politics. While this is important in itself, secularism in the Indian context also should mean the right of equality and opportunity to all languages, cultures, traditions to co-exist and thrive without the fear of domination of any one by the other. Looking at the issue in this manner would immediately suggest that secularism and democracy in India are inseparable. The protection of the rights of minorities of all variety (religious, linguistic etc) is an integral part of democracy. Religious or linguistic intolerance impinges, therefore, upon not only secularism but also democracy.

Hence, any attack on secularism in India is also simultaneously an attack on democracy and democratic institutions. It is, therefore, no coincidence that rabid Hindu communalism that today, albeit temporarily, controls the reins of power, targets not only the secular foundations by spreading the hatred of religious intolerance but also attacks democratic institutions. The efforts to re-write the Indian Constitution, the strident cries for a presidential form of government - all are part of the larger jigsaw puzzle to facilitate the establishment of a "Hindu Rashtra".

The attempts to re-write Indian history and to doctor the educational system on communal lines must also be seen in the same light. Much of Dr. Zakir Husain's life and work related to this field. He would have been aghast at the travesty of history that is currently being undertaken by the communal forces.

It is, indeed, unfortunate that this assault on India's secular democracy comes in the name of religion. By now, it is clear that religious fundamentalism of all variety, Taliban or Saffron, has very little to do with religion or religiosity. It is purely an attempt to consolidate political power by misusing religion.

Seeking your indulgence, I think it necessary to digress and put at rest a great deal of controversy that has always existed regarding the Marxist understanding of religion. The popular

perception is the normally out of context quotation that "religion is the opium of the people". In fact, deliberately, the passage in which this statement finds place is never quoted in the full. Marx had stated: "Religious distress is at the same time the expression of real distress and the protest against real distress. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of the heartless world, just as it is the spirit of the spiritless situation. It is the opium of the people."(Introduction to the critique of Hegel's philosophy of Right, 1844).

Religion, is the opium in the sense that it is as potent as opium is in creating an illusory world. For a human being who is oppressed, religion provides the escape for relief, it provides a "heart in a heartless world, a spirit in a spiritless situation." For this precise reason, it is the opium that the people require, to lull themselves into submission so long as they continue to remain in conditions which appear outside of both their comprehension and control.

The Marxist understanding of religion is essentially integrated with its entire philosophic foundations. In pursuit of the simple question of what constitutes the real freedom of a human being and his consequent liberation, Marx proceeded to reject the Hegelian idea of the revolution of the mind as represented by Feuerbach, during his time, to come to a conclusion of seminal importance. That was: consciousness of a human being is determined by the social conditions and not vice a versa. "It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary their social being that determines their consciousness"(Introduction to the critique of Political economy). The recent discoveries and conclusions of the "Genome Project" resoundingly vindicate this understanding.

Religion, therefore, for Marx and Marxists is a product of the social conditions in which man existed and continues to exist. The history of religion, in one sense, is also a reflection of the history of human evolution. Hence, religion, like any other form of consciousness is not a thing in itself but a reflection of the real world. In so far as human beings are unable to comprehend the forces of nature or of society that appear to determine their day to day existence and guide their destinies, the need for creating

a extraterrestrial supernatural force remains. Religion therefore, provides for the human being a sense of comfort, beauty and solace that he cannot find in the real life. At the same time, religion, also being the dominant form of ideology, is an expression of the class struggle that is taking place in society at a point of time.

This then is the Marxist materialist understanding and appreciation of religion. Its humanist content and at the same time its utilisation as a instrument of class rule have to be understood in its totality. A communist works to change the conditions that continues to give rise to the hold of religion and not attack religion per se because it is not and can never be a thing in itself independent of the social organisation of human civilisation.

Let us return to the main theme. The use or the misuse of religion and religious sentiments for consolidating the political rule was perfected by the British in the Indian sub-continent. Following the 1857 First War of independence, where Rani Lakshmi Bai and Begum Hazrat Mahal fought shoulder to shoulder with Maulavi Ahmadullah and Rao Tula Ram rattled the British. Bahadur Shah Zafar , the Mughal Monarch was the symbol of this struggle. The most important lesson that the British learned from this was that they could not continue to rule India allowing the Hindus, Muslims and feudal Princes to find common cause. As a contemporary chronicler, Thomas Lowe, exclaimed: "the infanticide Rajput, the begoted brahmin, the fanatic mussalman join together in the cause; cow killer and the cow worshiper, the pig-hater and the pig eater had revolted together"! Any recurrence of such an event had to be prevented. The British therefore forged their notorious policy of `divide and rule'. Thus began the fomenting of venomous hatred between the Hindus and Muslims, in which process, they were admirably aided by the communal forces on both sides. This policy made such inroads into the fabric of Indian society, so flamed the unity and amity among its people that till date, we continue to pay the price.

It is, therefore, clear that the struggle to safeguard secular democracy in India, the struggle against Hindu communalism cannot be met by other forms of minority religious fundamentalisms. In fact, fundamentalisms of all variety - Hindu,

Muslim, Christian or Sikh - only feed each other. The only way to preserve and strengthen India's secular democracy will have to be through forging strong common bonds amongst peoples cutting across religions and other diversities.

Such a common struggle is the only way in which the fascistic agenda of the RSS and its tentacles can be countered. Apart from adopting Goebbelsian propaganda techniques (Goebbels was Hitler's propaganda minister, whose famous dictum was to tell a big enough lie, frequently enough to make it the truth). Such forces also invoke nationalism and morality as a potent weapon. In reality, however, their policies are precisely the opposite. While invoking national jingoism, at the drop of the hat, these forces have no compunction whatsoever in bartering our country's security interests for personal profit. The depths of political immorality to which they can sink has been exposed by the tehelka scandal.

Georgi Dimitrov, the indomitable hero of the struggle against Nazi fascism, had noted: "Fascism puts the people at the mercy of the most corrupt and venal elements but comes before them with the demand for `an honest and incorruptible government'' speculating on the profound disillusionment of the masses ...fascism adapts its demagogy to the peculiarities of each country.

And the mass of petty bourgeois and even a section of the workers, reduced to despair by want, unemployment and insecurity of their existence fall victim to the social and chauvinist demagogy of fascism". (Dimitrov, Selected Works, Vol. 2, 1972, p. 12). It is precisely this feature of fascism that defines the demagogy and campaigns of the Saffron Brigade today.

Hence, what we find today is a situation where fascistic communalism is mounting an unprecedented attack on secular democracy and, in the process, it is redefining the meaning of nationalism and political morality. Having mustered votes in the name of `swadeshi' they are implementing `videshi' economic policies. Their brand of nationalism mortgages India, on the one hand, and imposes unprecedented burdens on the people, on the other. They are acting as the best agents of US Imperialism, which seeks the economic recolonisation of India.

What is required is not an inward looking insulated exclusivist minority response to meet this challenge. What is required is the broad based unity of all forces willing to defend India's secular democracy and economic sovereignty. This is the real meaning of patriotism in the present context.

It was Golwalkar who had once said that the three internal enemies of concept of "Hindu Rashtra" are the Muslims, Christians and the Communists. I would only like to add that it is the majority of the Indian people irrespective of being religious or atheist, who are opposed to the conversion of a secular democratic Indian Republic into the RSS version of "Hindu Rashtra". India's unity and integrity can only be maintained by strengthening the bonds of commonality that exists within our large diversity. Any attempt to impose a uniformity upon this diversity as communalism and fundamentalism seek today can only lead to the disintegration of the country. Let us unite to save India today so that we can change India for the better tomorrow. Over the past century and more, Urdu and the Indian National Congress have been synonymous. Urdu has contributed to the shaping of the linguistic and cultural life of other major Indian languages much in the same way as Congress has helped in building the national character of India. Progressing very rapidly from its birth and becoming the lingua franca of most of India in the seventeenth century, Urdu also became, the repository of a very large and valuable treasure of literature. By pursuing similar goals and traversing the path that Urdu had taken earlier, in the post-independence era, Hindi expanded its base in various states and regions of the nation.

As a literary language Urdu had seeped into and strengthened social structures and impacted various local and regional languages in a decisive manner that shaped the composite cultural character of Indian polity. When Hindi, with a linguistic structure similar to Urdu, endeavoured to extend its roots to the South, the existing literary traditions of Urdu helped in a significant way.

Historically, Urdu and Hindi are sisters, allies in cultural and political renaissance, and not adversaries. The rich works of Amir Khusrou and, in our times, of the great Premchand himself are a permanent proof of this. It was the rich amalgamated form of

Urdu-Hindi - what we call Hindustani - which the Indian National Congress recognized from the very beginning of our freedom struggle as our national language.

It was the Hindustani slogan of Inquilab Zindabad that reverberated in our national consciousness and united us all in our struggle for national independence. It was Gandhiji who proposed Hindustani as the national language of India. Today, Hindustani lives on in the homes and streets of India despite not having an official recognition.

After independence, the Indian National Congress included Urdu, along with other major Indian languages in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution of India. Urdu was the mother tongue of millions of Indians living in almost all parts of the country. Its warmth, beauty and elegance continue to attract many people who are not natural born speakers of Urdu. It is important that friends or foes of Urdu do not confine it to one community or religion. Urdu is the language of brotherhood and camaraderie. It is the language of amity and harmony.

It is not the language of any one region or of any one community. It is part of India's composite heritage. It is sad that certain forces, playing politics of language, tried to label Urdu as a foreign language, while it is a well-known historical fact that Urdu was born and developed in the same region of Delhi where we are meeting today.

Having failed in their designs to slot Urdu as a foreign language, they tried to undermine the independent existence of Urdu by declaring it to be a stylistic variant of Hindi. The intention behind such a move was also to deny Urdu the status of a second official language in the Hindi speaking States of the North, particularly Uttar Pradesh where the speakers of Urdu are most numerous. Unfortunately, the very forces that are inimical to Urdu are also sowing the seeds of hatred among various communities. They have extended their stranglehold over political power and are promoting social and religious stereotypes unbecoming of our great nation. The cause of Urdu is common with the concept of humanism and peaceful coexistence that are at the heart of all religions. The future of Urdu and of our secular, liberal traditions are intrinsically linked.

The most signifant and practical necessity today is the need for promoting Urdu as a school subject of study. This would be possible only when in the three language formula, evolved and accepted under the National Educational Policy, Urdu as the mother tongue of millions, is assigned the same status as its sister Indian languages. For this, continuous efforts need to be made at the level of curriculum development and curriculum introduction so that teaching and learning of Urdu are made interesting and meaningful.

At the level of curriculum there is considerable concern about NCERT and its dangerous attempts to rewrite history. Rajivji had purposefully given the Ministry of Education the nomenclature of the Ministry of Human Resource Development. Now this very ministry is being converted into a workshop for fabricating and putting into practice an agenda that will undermine the secular and composite cultural character of India.

Urdu is uppermost in the list of features to be vanquished. Among the other similar targets are the traditional madarsas imparting religious education. Under the pretext of modernizing them, and of internal security concerns, there will inevitably be an attempt to subvert their noble traditions and heritage.

Of course many farsighted persons involved in 'madarsa' education recognize that religious madarsas need to be modernized and given a solid scientific and technological foundation. Rajivji had initiated a scheme for this. While the madarsas are recognizing the necessity of moving with the times, the self styled cultural police refuse to recognize the fact that the relegation of teaching and learning of Urdu only to the madarsas is actually due to the fact that it is not being made available as an integral part of the school curricula.

To promote the teaching and learning of Urdu at the primary and secondary levels of education is the responsibility of the state and Urdu speakers in every state must demand this. After the 93rd Amendment to the Constitution of India, the right of Urdu speakers to obtain education in the medium of their mother tongue has to be recognized as a fundamental right. The situation must be addressed with a sense of urgency. While the minorities have a valuable right to set up religious institutions for religious

education, it would be unfair to equate Urdu with Islam alone. In that spirit the Congress party has undertaken a major endeavour for the revival and promotion of Urdu as a living heritage, as the legacy of each and every Indian. Our governments are committed to this cause as a national obligation.

Dr. Zakir Hussain was sent first for his education to the Islamia High School in Etawah (U.P.) which specialised in puritanical strictures. After finishing school, he joined the M.A.O. College at Aligarh and studied upto the M.A. When the Indian National Congress and the All India Khilafat Committee joined hands in launching the Non-Cooperation Movement, Mahatma Gandhi toured the country to induce teachers and students to leave Government administered schools and colleges. The young Zakir Hussain, who was then half-student and half-teacher, very prominent among the students and very popular with a large section of the staff, persuaded Hakim Ajmal Khan and other leaders to establish a national institution at Aligarh, and the Jamia Millia Islamia came into being on 29 October, 1920. But Zakir Hussain did not wish to leave his studies incomplete and he went to the University of Berlin in Germany for higher studies in 1923, returning with a doctorate in Economics three years later. He rejoined the Jamia Millia in February-March, 1926 and became the Shaikhu Jamia (Vice-Chancellor). It was at the Jamia Millia that Dr. Zakir Hussain developed his gifts as an educationist. It was his experience here as well as his deep study of the philosophy of education which enable him to take charge of the scheme of Basic National Education when it was launched in 1938. He was the President of Hindustani Talimi Sangh, Sevagram from 1938 to 1948.

In November 1948, Dr. Zakir Hussain was appointed Vice-Chancellor of the Aligarh Muslim University. He was also nominated a member of the Indian Universities Commission. The World University Service made him the Chairman of the Indian National Committee and in 1954 he was elected the World President of the organization. He was also nominated to the Rajya Sabha and made the Indian representative on the Executive Board of the UNESCO from 1956 to 1958. He remained the Chairman, Central Board of Secondary Education, till 1957, a member of the University

Grants Commission till 1957, a member of the University Education Commission in 1948-1949 and of the Educational Reorganisation Committee of Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. In 1957 he was appointed the Governor of Bihar and in 1962 he was declared elected as the Head of the State and was formally sworn in as the Third President of the Indian Republic four days later. He held the highest office of the country with exemplary grace and dignity till his sudden death on 3 May, 1969.

Dr. Zakir Hussain was awarded Padma Vibhushan in 1954 and Bharat Ratna in 1963. He was awarded D.Litt. (Honoris Causa) by the Universities of Delhi, Calcutta, Aligarh, Allahabad and Cairo.

Many demands were made on Dr. Zakir Hussain's time and he was not able to undertake many scholarly projects which he had in mind. His interest in literary and academic work was so keen that he translated Plato's 'Republic' and Cannon's 'Elementary Political Economy'into Urdu soon after joining the Jamia Millia in 1920. While in Germany, he got an edition of the 'Diwan-I-Ghalib' printed - doing much of the compositing himself, because the press did not have enough staff - and also brought out a book in German on Mahatma Gandhi (Die Botschaft des Mahatma Gandhi') . He delivered a series of lectures on economics under the auspices of the Hindustani Academy and another series in English, on Capitalism: Essays in Understanding, under the auspices of the Delhi University in 1945. He also translated Friedrich List's 'Nationalockonomic'. His Convocation Addresses have been collected and published under the title "The Dynamic University". But he excelled in writing for children and his stories are masterpieces of style.

Tall, well-built, fair in complexion, with anoble forehead, a sensitive aristocratic nose, a well-trimmed beard and always neatly and tastefully dressed in sherwani and pyjama, Dr. Zakir Hussain was an imposing embodiment of culture and refinement. He was sensitive to beauty in all its forms and had an intense passion for excellence. His varied tastes and hobbies, his love of roses, his collection of cacti, fossils, paintings and specimens of calligraphy, objets d'art, and curios and above all, his rich library are evidence of his versatile personality.

He was steeped in the spiritual and aesthetic culture and the ethical principles of the Muslim Sufis and poets. He had the sufi's indifference towards the externals of religion and, though a deeply religious man, his religiosity was never obvious. It was the inspiration for secularism by which he endeared himself to men of different religious communities.

Dr. Zakir Hussain's nationalism was, like Gandhiji's, a reflection of his allegiance to the highest moral values and to the ideals of a culture which had become the whole of his own self. It was a nationalism which demanded for the individual that freedom which is the essence of democracy, that self-discipline which is the foundation of democratic citizenship and that identification with the good of the society which gives substance and meaning to the life of the individual.

10

Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan

Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan (b. at Hashtnagar in Utmanzai, Peshawar, North-West Frontier Province, British India, c. 1890 - d. in Peshawar, NWFP, Pakistan, 20 January 1988) was a Pashtun Indian political and spiritual leader known for his non-violent opposition to British Rule in India. A lifelong pacifist, a devout Muslim, and a follower of Mahatma Gandhi, he was also known as Badshah Khan (also Bacha Khan, Urdu, Pashto: lit., "King of Chiefs"), and Sarhaddi Gandhi (Urdu: lit., "Frontier Gandhi"). In 1985 he was nominated for the Nobel peace prize. In 1987 he became the first non-citizen to be awarded the Bharat Ratna, India's highest civilian award.

EARLY YEARS

Ghaffar Khan was born into a generally peaceful and prosperous family from Charsadda, in the Peshawar Valley. His father, Behram Khan, was a land owner, farmer, and the chief of the Mohammedzais ("sons of Mohamed") tribe of the Pashtun (Pathan) people. Ghaffar was the second son of Behram to attend the British run Edward's mission school -- an unusual arrangement since it was discouraged by the local mullahs. At school the young Ghaffar did well in his studies and was inspired by his mentor Reverend Wigram to see the importance of education in service to the community.

In his 10th and final year of high school he was offered a highly prestigious commission in The Guides, an elite corp of Pashtun soldiers of the British Raj. Ghaffar refused the commission after realising even Guide officers were still second-class citizens

in their own country. He resumed his intention of University study and Reverend Wigram offered him the opportunity to follow his brother, Khan Sahib, to study in London. While he eventually received the permission of his father, Ghaffar's mother wasn't willing to lose another son to London -- and their own culture and religion as the mullahs warned her. So Ghaffar began working on his father's lands while attempting to discern what more he might do with his life.

GHAFFAR "BADSHAH" KHAN

In response to his inability to continue his own education, Ghaffar Khan turned to helping others start theirs. Like many such regions of the world, the strategic importance of the newly formed North West Frontier Province (NWFP) as a buffer for the British Raj from Russian influence was of little benefit to its residents. The oppression of the British, the repression of the mullahs, and an ancient culture of violence and vendetta prompted Ghaffar to want to serve and uplift his fellow men and women by means of education. At 20 years of age, Ghaffar opened his first school in Utmanzai. It was an instant success and he was soon invited into a larger circle of progressively minded reformers.

While he faced much opposition and personal difficulties, Ghaffar Khan worked tirelessly to organize and raise the consciousness of his fellow Pushtuns. Between 1915 and 1918 he visited every one of the 500 settled districts of the Frontier. It was in this frenzied activity that he had come to be known as Badshah (Bacha) Khan (King of Chiefs).

He married his first wife Meharqanda in 1912; she was a daughter of Yar Mohammad Khan of the Kinankhel clan of the Mohammadzai tribe of Razzar, a village adjacent to Utmanzai. They had a son in 1913, Abdul Ghani Khan, who would become a noted artist and poet. Subsequently, they had another son, Abdul Wali Khan (17 January 1917-), and daughter, Sardaro. Meharqanda died during the 1918 influenza epidemic. In 1920, Abdul Ghaffar Khan remarried; his new wife, Nambata, was a cousin of his first wife and the daughter of Sultan Mohammad Khan of Razzar. She bore him a daughter, Mehar Taj (25 May 1921-), and a son, Abdul Ali Khan (20th August 1922-19 February

1997). Tragically, in 1926 Nambata died early as well from a fall down the stairs of the apartment they were staying at in Jerusalem.

KHUDAI KHIDMATGAR

In time, Ghaffar Khan's goal came to be the formulation of a united, independent, secular India. To achieve this end, he founded the Khudai Khidmatgar ("Servants of God"), commonly known as the "Red Shirts" (Surkh Posh), during the 1920s.

The Khudai Khidmatgar was founded on a belief in the power of Gandhi's notion of Satyagraha, a form of active non-violence as captured in an oath. He told its members:

I am going to give you such a weapon that the police and the army will not be able to stand against it. It is the weapon of the Prophet, but you are not aware of it. That weapon is patience and righteousness. No power on earth can stand against it.

The organization recruited over 100,000 members and became legendary in opposing (and dying at the hands of) the British-controlled police and army. Through strikes, political organisation and non-violent opposition, the Khudai Khidmatgar were able to achieve some success and came to dominate the politics of the NWFP. His brother, Dr. Khan Abdul Jabbar Khan (known as Dr. Khan Sahib), led the political wing of the movement, and was the Chief Minister of the province (from the late 1920s until 1947 when his government was dismissed by Mohammad Ali Jinnah of the Muslim League).

GHAFFAR KHAN & THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS

Ghaffar Khan forged a close, spiritual, and uninhibited friendship with Mahatma Gandhi, the pioneer of non-violent mass civil disobedience in India. The two had a deep admiration towards each other and worked together closely till 1947.

The Khudai Khidmatgar agitated and worked cohesively with the Indian National Congress, the leading national organization fighting for freedom, of which Ghaffar Khan was a senior and respected member. On several occasions when the Congress seemed to disagree with Gandhi on policy, Ghaffar Khan remained his staunchest ally. In 1931 the Congress offered him the presidency

of the party, but he refused saying, "I am a simple soldier and Khudai Khidmatgar, and I only want to serve." He remained a member of the Congress Working Committee for many years, resigning only in 1939 because of his differences with the Party's War Policy. He rejoined the Congress Party when the War Policy was revised.

On April 23, 1930, Ghaffar Khan was arrested during protests arising out of the Salt Satyagraha. A crowd of Khudai Khidmatgar gathered in Peshawar's Kissa Khwani (Storytellers) Bazaar. The British ordered troops to open fire with machine guns on the unarmed crowd, killing an estimated 200-250. The Khudai Khidmatgar members acted in accord with their training in non-violence under Ghaffar Khan, facing bullets as the troops fired on them.

Ghaffar Khan was a champion of women's rights and nonviolence. He became a hero in a society dominated by violence; notwithstanding his liberal views, his unswerving faith and obvious bravery led to immense respect. Throughout his life, he never lost faith in his non-violent methods or in the compatibility of Islam and nonviolence. He viewed his struggle as a jihad with only the enemy holding swords. He was closely identified with Gandhi and he is known in India as the `Frontier Gandhi'.

"O Pathans! Your house has fallen into ruin. Arise and rebuild it, and remember to what race you belong." — *Ghaffar Khan*

THE PARTITION

Ghaffar Khan strongly opposed the partition of India. While many Pashtuns (particularly the Red Shirts) were willing to work with Indian politicians, some Pashtuns desired independence from both India and the newly created state of Pakistan following the departure of the British. Targeted with being Anti-Muslim Ghaffar was attacked by fellow Muslims in 1946, leading to his hospitalisation in Peshawar.

The Congress party refused last ditch compromises to prevent the partition, like the Cabinet mission plan and Gandhi's suggestion to offer the Prime Ministership to Jinnah. As a result Bacha Khan and his followers felt a sense of betrayal by both Pakistan and India. Bacha Khan's last words to Gandhi and his erstwhile allies in the Congress party were: "You have thrown us to the wolves."

When given a choice between Pakistan and India, most voters chose Pakistan by a margin of 9 to 1 in 1947. A loya jirga in the Tribal Areas garnered a similar result as most preferred to become part of Pakistan. Khan asked his supporters to boycott the polls 56% came to vote.

In February 1948, Khan took the oath of allegiance to the new nation of Pakistan. Shortly afterwards he addressed the Pakistan constituent assembly and announced his support for Pakistan, while at the same time his Khudai Khidmatgar movement pledged allegiance to Pakistan and severed all links to the Congress Party.

ARREST AND EXILE

Under the new Pakistani government, Ghaffar Khan was under house arrest without charge from 1948 till 1954. Released from prison he gave a speech again on the floor of the constituent assembly, this time condemning the massacre of his supporters at Babra Sharif.

"I had to go to prison many a time in the days of the Britishers. Although we were at loggerheads with them, yet their treatment was to some extent tolerant and polite. But the treatment which was meted out to me in this Islamic state of ours was such that I would not even like to mention it to you."

It's tragic that India and Pakistan are almost constantly in a state of animosity and are now facing off against each other with nuclear weapons. It's also ironic, since both countries can claim pacifist pioneers. India has Gandhi, as most everyone knows. But few people know about Abdul Ghaffar Khan, a proponent of nonviolence and social change who lived in Pakistan.

Khan resided in what is now the North-West Frontier Province of Pakistan, and he was affectionately known as the "Frontier Gandhi." As Gandhi was given the title of Mahatma, meaning "Great Soul," Khan was given the title Badshah, meaning "Leader" or "King."

A devout practitioner of nonviolence and social reform, Khan worked to spread his ideals in the region. Eluding at least two

assassination attempts and surviving three decades in prison, he remained committed to nonviolence to the day he died in 1988 at the age of ninety-eight.

"For today's children and the world, my thoughts are that only if they accept nonviolence can they escape destruction, with all this talk of the atom bomb, and live a life of peace," Khan told an interviewer in 1985. "If this doesn't happen, then the world will be in ruins."

Asfandiyar Wali Khan, Ghaffar's grandson, remembers two basic lessons his grandfather gave him about the superiority of nonviolence.

"He said that violence needs less courage than nonviolence," says Asfandiyar, who resides in Peshawar, Pakistan. "Second, violence will always breed hatred. Nonviolence breeds love."

As a young man, Ghaffar Khan started a school for Pashtun children. Soon, he came under the influence of Haji Abdul Wahid Sahib, a social reformer. Before long, he had established contact with other progressive Muslim leaders in India, who urged him to work for the education and uplift of the Pashtuns. But Ghaffar Khan was still searching for answers. In 1914, he performed a fast that lasted for days. The fast strengthened his resolve to dedicate his life to social reform, and he spent the next few years touring the region. Soon he learned about Gandhi and his movement, which provided an enormous boost to Khan and his work.

Khan founded a nonviolent movement in 1929 called the Khudai Khidmatgar--the servants of God. This movement, which eventually involved more than 100,000 Pashtuns, was dedicated to social reform and to ending the rule of the British in then-undivided India.

Khan's calls for social change, more equitable land distribution, and religious harmony threatened some religious leaders and big landlords. But he toured incessantly, traveling twenty-five miles in a day, going from village to village, speaking about social reform and having his movement members stage dramas depicting the value of nonviolence.

"I visited a really remote village recently and was taking pride in the fact that I was the first outsider to be there," says Asfandiyar, the central president of the Awami (People's) National Party, which claims to carry on Ghaffar Khan's work. "However, I learned that Badshah Khan had been there in 1942. Imagine the conditions at the time. He must have had to walk ten to twelve hours to get there."

The British treated Ghaffar Khan and his movement with a barbarity that they did not often inflict on other adherents of nonviolence in India. "The brutes must be ruled brutally and by brutes," stated a 1930 British report on the Pashtuns.

The British thought of Ghaffar Khan's movement as a ruse. To them, "A nonviolent Pathan [another name for a Pashtun] was unthinkable, a fraud that masked something cunning and darkly treacherous," writes Eknath Easwaran in Nonviolent Soldier of Islam: Badshah Khan, A Man to Match His Mountains (Nilgiri Press, 1999).

The British thus reacted with a singular ferocity to the Khidmatgar desire for independence from British rule, subjecting Khidmatgar members throughout the 1930s and early 1940s to mass killings, torture, and destruction of their homes and fields. Khan himself spent fifteen of these years in prison, often in solitary confinement. But these Pashtuns refused to give up their adherence to nonviolence even in the face of such severe repression.

In the single worst incident, the British killed at least 200 Khidmatgar members in Peshawar on April 23, 1930. Gene Sharp, who has written a study of nonviolent resistance, describes the scene on that day: "When those in front fell down wounded by the shots, those behind came forward with their breasts bared and exposed themselves to the fire, so much so that some people got as many as twenty-one bullet wounds in their bodies, and all the people stood their ground without getting into a panic. . . . The Anglo-Indian paper of Lahore, which represents the official view, itself wrote to the effect that the people came forward one after another to face the firing and when they fell wounded they were dragged back and others came forward to be shot at. This state of things continued from 11 till 5 o'clock in the evening. When the number of corpses became too many, the ambulance cars of the government took them away."

The carnage stopped only because a regiment of Indian soldiers finally refused to continue firing on the unarmed protesters, an impertinence for which they were severely punished.

With his commitment to Hindu-Muslim unity, Ghaffar Khan was firmly opposed to the creation of Pakistan, which was founded as a homeland for the Muslims of the Indian subcontinent. He also thought that the rights of the Pashtuns would be better respected in a large, decentralized, united India rather than in a smaller, more centralized Pakistan. After Pakistan's creation, he started demanding a separate region, or Pashtunistan, for the Pashtuns. He left it deliberately ambiguous whether he wanted this area to be within Pakistan or a separate country.

All this gave the Pakistani authorities the opportunity to accuse him of anti-national activities. They jailed and killed some of his followers. Khan was imprisoned again for more than a decade. The Pakistan government banned the Khidmatgar movement and razed its headquarters, but Khan continued his work.

"The Khidmatgar movement was one of self-reform and introspection," says Mukulika Banerjee, author of The Pathan Unarmed: Opposition and Memory in the North West Frontier (School of American Research Press, 2000). "It involved two crucial elements: Islam and Pukhtunwali (the Pashtun tribal code). Here nonviolence becomes an ideological system very compatible with Islam and Pukhtunwali, since these are reinterpreted."

The movement had "first of all, a religious basis," writes nonviolence scholar Joan V. Bondurant in Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict (Princeton University Press, 1988). "It took as its objective both local socioeconomic reform and political independence. . . . Its adoption of nonviolence was more thorough than that of the Indian National Congress inasmuch as the Khudai Khidmatgar pledged themselves to nonviolence not only as a policy, but as a creed, a way of life."

Khan Stressed the Compatibility of Islam and Nonviolence

"There is nothing surprising in a Muslim or a Pathan like me subscribing to the creed of nonviolence," Ghaffar Khan is quoted in Easwaran's biography. "It is not a new creed. It was followed 1,400 years ago by the Prophet all the time when he was in Mecca."

For Khan, Islam meant muhabbat (love), amal (service), and yakeen (faith).

Khan once told Gandhi of a discussion he had with a Punjabi Muslim who didn't see the nonviolent core of Islam. "I cited chapter and verse from the Koran to show the great emphasis that Islam had laid on peace, which is its coping stone," Khan said. "I also showed to him how the greatest figures in Islamic history were known more for their forbearance and self-restraint than for their fierceness. The reply rendered him speechless."

Khan interpreted Islam as a moral code with pacifism at its center.

"Badshah Khan told people that Islam operates on a simple principle--never hurt anyone by tongue, by gun, or by hand," says Begum Nasim Wali Khan, Ghaffar's daughter-in-law, who is the provincial president of the Awami National Party. "Not to lie, steal, and harm is true Islam."

But the movement was nonsectarian. When Hindus and Sikhs were attacked in Peshawar, 10,000 Khidmatgar members helped protect their lives and property. And when riots broke out in the state of Bihar in 1946 and 1947, Khan toured with Gandhi to bring about peace.

"Although the character of the movement was intensely Islamic . . . one of the objectives of the organization was the promotion of Hindu-Muslim unity," Bondurant observes.

In the early 1990s, Banerjee, a lecturer in anthropology at University College London, spent months in the frontier region with Khan's family and interviewed seventy surviving Khidmatgar members. She says that while people initially joined the organization due to Khan's charisma and persuasiveness, later on it was due to the excitement of becoming part of something larger than themselves. And their commitment to nonviolence was stronger than their allegiance to Khan. When Gandhi asked some of them in 1938 if they would take up violence if Ghaffar Khan told them to, they replied with an emphatic no.

Mubarak Awad, a Palestinian American who is the director of Nonviolence International, has derived inspiration from Ghaffar Khan and has translated his speeches and work into Arabic.

"I was so happy to learn about him and meet some of his followers," he says. "He practiced Islam and nonviolence and showed that it was not only for the weak. He came from a group of people--the Pathans--who were warriors."

Awad says Khan was an eye-opener for a lot of Muslims. "He was a soldier of Islam but in a nonviolent way," he says. "He showed that even a strong person could be nonviolent."

Khan believed in equality for women and was emphatic about female education, Asfandiyar says. "If we achieve success and liberate the motherland, we solemnly promise you that you will get your rights," he pledged to women. "In the Holy Koran, you have an equal share with men. You are today oppressed because we men have ignored the commands of God and the Prophet."

The movement encouraged equal participation of women from the start. "Pathan women participating in nonviolent action campaigns would frequently take their stand facing the police or would lie down in orderly lines holding copies of the Koran," Bondurant writes.

Like Gandhi, Khan lived a simple life, and due to his extensive political activities and lengthy bouts of imprisonment, he often neglected his family. "He was a person who denied the luxuries of life first to himself and then wanted you to deny them to yourself," Asfandiyar says.

Hiro Shroff, an Indian journalist who met Ghaffar Khan in the 1950s, observed in a recent article for the web publication Sawaal.com that "his total belongings did not weigh more than a few pounds. His belongings consisted of a bed sheet, a towel, and, I think, a spare set of salwar and kameez [clothing]. That was all."

Professor Satti Khanna of Duke University met Khan when he visited India in 1985 at the age of ninety-five for the centennial celebrations of the Congress Party, with which Khan and Gandhi were associated. Khanna interviewed him for a 1987 documentary he made on India's partition, entitled Division of Hearts.

"He was a presence rather than a person," Khanna remembers. "He had an emanation of profound integrity."

So why is Khan almost unknown? For one thing, he has gotten a raw deal in South Asia itself. Due to his differences with the Pakistani authorities, Khan's name does not appear in official Pakistani history. Hence, he is little known in Pakistan outside the frontier area. Indeed, some of my Pakistani friends are barely aware of him.

"There's been a complete erasure of the man and the movement from Pakistani historiography," Banerjee says. "The younger generation even in that region hasn't heard of him."

If he is recognized at all, it is as a Pashtun nationalist, rather than as a proponent of nonviolence and social reform.

In India, Ghaffar Khan has also been handled unfairly. Most often, he is portrayed as an adjunct of Gandhi (hence the term "Frontier Gandhi").

But Ghaffar Khan started forming his project of nonviolence and social reform before he came into contact with Gandhi. And his nonviolence drew its inspiration from the Koran and the Prophet Muhammad, in contrast to Gandhi, whose ideals were largely based on the Hindu holy book the Bhagavad Gita, the Bible, and the writings of Thoreau and Tolstoy.

There are other factors that contribute to Khan's obscurity.

"Gandhi left behind an enormous amount of written work," Banerjee says. "With Khan, the whole thing dies with him, apart from his autobiography."

In addition, Khan chose to spend his life in Pakistan and Afghanistan, rather than visiting the West, as Gandhi did.

But this shouldn't keep us from recognizing the remarkable journey embarked upon by Khan and his fellow Pashtuns--a community that the Taliban has recently given a terrible name.

Nonviolence, religious tolerance, women's rights, and social justice--certainly Khan could have done a lot worse than to spread these ideals. And he did it while deriving his inspiration from a religion some vilify as intrinsically intolerant.

Khan deserves a better fate than to languish in obscurity. He has a lot to offer, not least to the leaders of India and Pakistan.

FOLLOWER OF GANDHI

Abdul Ghaffar Khan, a Moslem disciple of Mohandas K. Gandhi who opposed British rule in India and partition of the subcontinent, died yesterday in a hospital in Peshawar, Pakistan. He was 98 years old and had suffered a stroke six months ago.

Abdul Ghaffar Khan, a Moslem disciple of Mohandas K. Gandhi who opposed British rule in India and partition of the subcontinent, died yesterday in a hospital in Peshawar, Pakistan. He was 98 years old and had suffered a stroke six months ago.

A tough Pathan tribesman from India's old northwest frontier, Mr. Ghaffar Khan's martial beak of a nose and towering and powerful physique - at six and a half feet, he once weighed 220 pounds - made him look capable in earlier years of wrestling a bullock to the ground.

Yet, often dressed like his mentor in homespun clothes and with his hair and beard clipped short, Mr. Ghaffar Khan spent a lifetime advocating nonviolence to achieve his political aims - and at least 25 years in British and Pakistani jails for doing so.

The causes he fought for from the early 1920's until his last arrest by the Pakistan Government in 1976 were the independence of India, a unified India as homeland for both Hindu and Moslem, and Pathan autonomy in the Pakistan created when India gained independence in 1947. The only goal he attained was the first.

The Indian Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi, stopped in Peshawar yesterday on his way to Sweden to pay tribute to the man who was known in India during the long struggle with the British as the ''frontier Gandhi,'' and who last year was honored with India's highest civilian award, the Jewel of India. 'A Freedom Fighter'

Prime Minister Gandhi hailed Mr. Ghaffar Khan as a ''freedom fighter'' who was devoted to ''nonviolence and wonderful humanity.'' The world, Mr. Gandhi said, ''has lost a very good man.''

A measure of the different feelings about Mr. Ghaffar Khan in India and Pakistan was the immediate declaration of a five-day period of mourning for him in India and the lack of a similar declaration in Pakistan.

Mr. Ghaffar Khan, whose father was a Pathan tribal chief, was born in 1889 in the scrubby mountains that spill across the border into Afghanistan. In those days of the British Raj and Kipling's tales of valor at the Khyber Pass, Mr. Ghaffar Khan carried the hereditary warrior landowning title of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan and, informally as he gained prominence, the King of Khans.

But all the trappings of rank were to change after he met Mahatma Gandhi in 1919. Over the next decade, Mr. Ghaffar Khan grew increasingly close to Mr. Gandhi until by the late 1930's he, Jawaharlal Nehru and Vallabhai Patel were among Gandhi's inner circle of advisers and leaders in the Congress Party, the dominant political expression of Indian nationalism.

In the late 1920's, Mr. Ghaffar Khan established a nonviolence movement called, interchangeably, the Servants of God and the Red Shirts. Its adherents, initially drawn from the poor northwest frontier peasantry, swore on the Koran to follow the teachings of Islam and, if persecuted, to refrain from violent resistance.

For almost two decades, Mr. Ghaffar Khan and his Red Shirts, so-called because of the bright scarlet color of their marching uniforms, walked thousands of miles around India urging Hindu and Moslem alike to practice civil disobedience and to join the political struggle for freedom.

Mr. Ghaffar Khan's leadership of the Red Shirts led to several arrests by the British without changing his attitude because, as he said once when emerging from a British jail, ''With love you can persuade a Pathan to go to hell, but by force you cannot take him even to heaven.'' In the end, the Red Shirts became an auxiliary of the Congress Party. Sought Separate State

By 1943, with the Moslem League under Mohammed Ali Jinnah gaining ascendancy over Mr. Ghaffar Khan's Congress Party movement as the voice of India's Moslems, Mr. Ghaffar Khan campaigned vigorously against Hindu-Moslem communal violence and the growing prospect of partition. In 1946, a year of bloody communal violence, Mr. Ghaffar Khan was hospitalized in Peshawar after being hit by stones thrown by rioters of his own faith.

Realizing on the eve of India's independence that partition could not be blocked, Mr. Ghaffar Khan unsuccessfully sought the establishment of a separate Northwest Frontier State to avoid the old Pathan province's absorption into Pakistan.

The new state of Pakistan, of which Mr. Jinnah was the Governor-General, promptly jailed Mr. Ghaffar Khan and his politically active older brother, Dr. M.L.A. Sahib Khan, for anti-state activities. They were held for six years, until 1954. Although Dr. Sahib Khan made peace with his jailers and joined Pakistan's first coalition Government as Minister of Communications in October 1954, Mr. Ghaffar Khan took a different political tack that was to put him back in jail on many occasions in the years ahead: the drive for an autonomous Pathanistan. In the 1960's, still at odds with the Pakistan Government, Mr. Ghaffar Khan went into exile in neighboring Afghanistan.

When Mr. Ghaffar Khan returned to Pakistan in 1972, the main political opposition group and spokesman for the Pathans, the National Awami Party, was headed by his son, Abdul Wali Khan.

In his will, Mr. Ghaffar Khan said he wanted to be buried at Jalalabad, 60 miles west of Peshawar, in Afghanistan, where he owned a house. His son said that his father's wishes would be carried out and that the funeral procession would head for the Khyber Pass after today's scheduled funeral in Jinnah Park in Peshawar.

An Associated Press report from Peshawar said both the Afghanistan and Pakistan Governments had indicated they would not interfere with the procession.

FAMOUS SPEECHES

In his speech to the assembly he said:

"Whenever I had an opportunity to address the people in different parts of our province, I told them clearly that indeed, I was of the opinion that India should not be divided because today in India we have witnessed the result. Thousands and thousands of young and old, children, men, and women were massacred and ruined. But now that the division is an accomplished fact, the

dispute is over. "I delivered many speeches against the division of India, but the question is: has anybody listened to me? You may hold any opinion about me, but I am not a man of destruction but of construction. If you study my life, you will find that I devoted it to the welfare of our country. We have proclaimed that if the Government of Pakistan would work for our people and our country the Khudai Khidmatgars would be with them. I repeat that I am not for the destruction of Pakistan. In destruction lies no good.

"Neither Hindus nor Muslims, nor the Frontier, not Punjab, Bengal or Sindh stands to gain from it. There is advantage only in construction. I want to tell you categorically I will not support anybody in destruction. If any constructive programme is before you, if you want to do something constructive for our people, not in theory, but in practice, I declare before this House that I and my people are at your service..." (Puri, pp 188-190)

"Where is the democracy that British gave us? Ayub Khan robbed us of it. And what did he give us in return ? He gave us his own version of democracy which does not even deserve the name of democracy.

Look at our financial position, look at our language, culture, society. He has taken it all. Look at our schools, our colleges, the education and instruction of our children. And look at his manners. I am always surprised at these people who keep telling us:"We are making such progress. Pakistan has a target and we are fast approaching it." Actually there are several jokes in circulation about that. I will tell you one. It goes like this:

A woman said to her husband, warmly embracing him: "Darling, I want a diamond nose-ornament!" The husband replied: "Actually I was considering how I could cut off your nose altogether."

All we are asking is for a nose ornament, it does not even have to be diamond. But Pakistan is thinking how they can cut off our nose altogether.""I want you and the Pakistani leaders to take a look at the misery which our Balochi brothers are living in. They have been asking and crying and shouting for their rights for the last twenty years. When nobody listened to them they had no

choice but to take up arms. You all know what happened to them, the tyranny they had to suffer, the cruelties that were committed. Now Pakistan has found that the question cannot be solved by cruelty and oppression, and these poor people are told; Come on, let us sit down together and settle our dispute. It did not take me long to find out that in the heart of Pakistan there is no room for any Baluchi or Sindhi or Bengali or Pakhtun.

Therefore I want my Baluchi brothers to know that the Sindhis and the Pakhtuns are just as oppressed and that our aim and objectives are the same. Pakistan's real design will be clear if you look at Punjab. The Punjab leaders met and had discussions and consultations with their Jirga. They said "look at the Pakhtuns, they are all very rich. They have electricity you know. Then they said; look at the Sindhis, they have so much land. About the Baluchis they said, they have in their country wealth of mineral resources and gas.

Brothers, all this is trickery and they are only saying all this because they want it for themselves: the electricity of Pathans, the land of Sindhis and the minerals of Baluchis. Then they have this idea of "one unit". Work it out for yourselves, is this in harmony with Islamic belief? Does Islam tell you to rob one brother of electricity, another brother of his fertile land and take possessions of the mines and minerals of another?

And you, ignorant and misguided Pathans, you do not even stop to think whether this is Islam or not, you just swallow anything you are told." One time the Pakistani Minister of Foreign affairs Manzur Qadir had come to see him over a statement made by Russian Prime Minister Khrushchev about Pakhtuns.

"He talked for four hours. First about democracy. He said, "Because here in Pakistan democracy did not work, we do not give the people democracy anymore"

I asked him, "Where was this democracy in the first place ? You never had democracy, so how do you know whether it works or not? In India they have had three or four elections. When did you last have elections in Pakistan? Did you ever? Have you ever asked the people what kind of government they want ?" "Better be poisoned in one's own blood then to be poisoned in one's

principle." "Today's world is traveling in some strange direction. You see that the world is going toward destruction and violence. And the specialty of violence is to create hatred among people and to create fear. I am a believer in nonviolence and I say that no peace or tranquility will descend upon the people of the world until nonviolence is practiced, because nonviolence is love and it stirs courage in people." Â- Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan to an interviewer in 1985.

While Mahatma Gandhi was fighting against the British regime in mainland India, the northwest fringes of the country, then known as the North-West Frontier Province and now part of Afghanistan, were witnessing the rise of yet another Mahatma-Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan.

Strongly inspired by Gandhi's strategy of nonviolence, Ghaffar Khan, or Badshah Khan as he was popularly known, amassed the world's first major nonviolent army in his region. He persuaded 100,000 of his countrymen to lay down guns and vow to fight nonviolently against the British regime. He termed this army the Khudai Khidmatgar, the servants of Allah. It was no mean achievement, considering the bloody and barbaric history of the Pashtun community- a history that was full of invasions, massacres, conquests and occupations. The Khudai Khidmatgar movement espoused nonviolent, nationalist agitation in support of Indian independence and sought to awaken the Pashtuns' political consensus.

A devout Muslim and committed ally of Gandhi, Ghaffar Khan worked in close collaboration with his inspirer for independence. For almost 80 long years, the Pashtun leader struggled incessantly for the rights of his people without ever raising arms. Like Gandhi, Ghaffar Khan honestly believed that the upliftment of his people was essential preparation for independence. Khan opened schools in the province, brought women into the mainstream of society, and encouraged his nonviolent soldiers to vow to do at least two hours of social work a day.

Aware of the pervasive violence in his society, Ghaffar Khan decided to invoke people on religious and humanistic grounds. To this purpose, he initiated a pledge that was to become the

motto of the Afghan people in their fight for freedom. The pledge went: " I promise to refrain from violence and from taking revenge. I will sacrifice my wealth, life and comfort for my nation and people." It called people to serve God by serving other people, which helped the growth of self-respect and human dignity.

Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan 's amazing success story will go down in the annals of nonviolent resistance not merely for its popularity but also for its innately simple and spiritual outlook. As Badshah Khan used to say: " Nonviolence is love and it stirs courage in people... No peace or tranquility can descend upon the people of the world until nonviolence is practised."

FRONTIER GANDHI : KHAN ABDUL GHAFFAR KHAN

Nonviolent action has been used by groups which have been famous for their very aggressive behaviour and violence. A case in point are the Pathans in the North-West Frontier Province of British India. Pathans were known for their cruelty-- they were bloodthirsty and highly vindictive. They led wild, free, active lives in the rugged mountain fortresses. War was their traditional business. The Pathans were Muslims, a religion widely regarded as approving of war for a good cause. Among these Pathans was Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan "the Frontier Gandhi" who organized a powerful movement of the Khudai Khidmatgars or True Servants of God, which was pledged to complete nonviolence and whose members became some of the bravest and most daring and reliable nonviolent resisters ofd India's struggle for independence. Their aggressiveness, bravery and daring found new nonviolent expressions through nonviolent techniques.

Ghaffar Khan wrote :

“I have one great desire:

I want to rescue these gentle, brave patriotic, people from the tyranny of the foreigners who have disgraced and dishonoured them.

I want to create for them a world of freedom, where they can live in peace, where they can laugh and be happy.

I want to kiss the ground where their ruined homes once stood, before they were destroyed by savage strangers.

I want to take a broom and sweep the alleys and the lanes, and I want to clean their houses with my own hands.

I want to wash away the stains of blood from their garments.

I want to show the world how beautiful they are, these people from the hills and then I want to reclaim: "Show me, if you can, any gentler, more courteous, more cultured people than these."

"The genius of Badshah Khan saw Pathan violence for what it was--a consequence not of bloodlust but of ignorance, superstition, and the crushing weight of custom. Beneath the violence and ignorance; Khan saw men and women capable of extraordinary self-effacement, endurance, and courage. He knew his task: to educate, to enlighten, to lift up, to inspire. With understanding, he saw the violenceand venality would fall from the Pathan character like dead limbs from a tree. It was his job to weild the axe."

The Northwest Frontier Province was the gateway to India and the people revered Abdul Ghaffar Khan as a saint and called him Badshah Khan, the "King of Khans". The British had reason to fear him. The Northwest Frontier Province was the only part of the British Empire never to be fully subjugated. This was inspite of shelling, burning,bombing, beating, jailing, and attempting to bribe them into submission. But nothing worked for long. It is no wonder then, that during the Indian freedom struggle, Khan and his 100,000 -man nonviolent army, were the target of severe and savage repression. Pathans had to endure mass shootings, torture, the destructionof their fields and homes, jail, flogging, and humiliations, but they remained nonviolent - suffering and dying in large numbers to win their freedom. The British were baffled by this change in the Pathans, from violence to nonviolence, they couldn't understandit -- or believe it, often in solitary confinement. He said :

"There is nothing surprising in a muslim or a Pathan like me subscribing to the creed of nonviolence. It is not a new creed. It was followed fourteen hundred years ago by the Prophet all the time he was in Mecca, and it has since been followed by all those who wanted to throw off an oppressor's yoke. But we had so far forgotten it that when Gandhiji placed it before us, we thought he was sponsoring a novel creed."

In organising the non-violent army there were three phases: first Khan set up Azad Schools, then formed Pakhtun Jirga, youth League, and then came the Khudai Khidmatgars.

With the Youth League he launched a new Program of educational, social and political reforms. This readied people for his next step which was nonviolent action.

One of his first concerns was the role of women. Badshah Khan had long lamented the traditional system of purdah, which restricts Muslim womenfrom participating fully in society. He encouraged them to come out behind the veil, as the women in his own family had done. His sisters became increasingly active in his movement, until by 1930 they were touring the districts of the Frontier and giving speeches--activities which would have required courage even in the cosmopolitan capitals of Islam, but which in the conservative Frontier showed truly extraordinary daring......

To help spread these ideas, Khan had been thinking for some time about starting a journal written in Pakhtu. He knew that Pathans who emigrated to other parts of the world were quick to adopt the local language and drop their mother tongue, and even in the Frontier, educated Pathans had abandoned Pakhtu in favour of English and Urdu. This saddened Khan. He loved the rolling rythms of his language and its body of folklore, epics, and lyrics, which included some of the finest mystical poetry on the subcontinent.

A journal in Pakhtu could restore the Pathan's pride in their own language, and at the same time carry the message of reform to all Pathans.

"The Pathan." was an instand success, not only in the Frontier but elsewhere -- even as far away as the United States, where many Pathans still live. Educated Pathans were delighted to find their "Pathanness" celebrated : they were a noble, daring, effervescent race.

This journal was also a help in preparing the Pathans for the change from violence to nonviolence. The next step was the Khidmatgars. Their motto was freedom, their aim, service. Since God himself needed no service, they would serve his people.

Khudai Khimatgars

The Khudai Khidmatgars, under the leadership of Abdul Ghaffar Khan, became history's first professional nonviolent army -- and its most improbable. Any Pathan could join, provided he took the army's oath :

I am a Khudai Khidmatgar, and as God needs no service, but serving his creation is serving him, I promise to serve humanity inthe name of God.

I promise to refrain from violence and from taking revenge. I promise to forgive those who oppress me or treat me with cruelty.

I promise to refrain from taking part in feuds and quarrels and from creating enmity.

I promise to treat every Pathan as my brother and friend.

I promise to refrain from antisocial customs and practices.

I promise to live a simple life, to practice virtue and to refrain from evil.

I promise to practice good manners and good behaviour and not to lead a life of idleness. I promise to devote at least two hours a day to social work......

They began by wearing a simple white oveshirt, but the white was soon dirtied. A couple of men had their shirts dyed at the local tannery, and the brick-red colour proved a breakthrough. It did not dirty easily, the dye was cheap, and - best of luck -- it had style. Villagers dropped their plows to see who these glowing figures were.

Recruits didnot come easily, but Khan and his five hundred volunteers persisted. Within a few months they had five hundred recruits -- not enough for a Raj-shattering holy war, but a beginning. Volunteers who took the oath formed platoons wih commanding officers and learned basic army discipline--everything that did not require the use of arms.

They had drills, hadges, a tricolor flag, the entire military hierarchy of mark--and a bagpipe crops......

Volunteers went to the villages and opened schools, held work projects, and maintained order at public gatherings. From

time to time they drilled in work camps and took long military-style marches into the hills. As they marched they sang :

We are the army of God,

By death or wealth unmoved,

We march, our leader and we,

Ready to die.

We serve and we love

Our people and our cause.

Freedom is our goal,

Our lives the price we pay.

Watching the narrow columns threading a curving mountain pass, one could easily imagine that some angry mullah was unleashing another holy war against the foreigners. But these Pathans, who for years had carried rifles and tucked small armories of revolvers and knives inside their waistbands, now carried only a stick for walking. They armed themselves only with their discipline, their faith, and their native mentle.

Under the leadership of the towering "Red Gandhi", Ghaffar Khan, the satyagrahis took over he city of Kabul, induced crack British units to lay down their arms and proved to the world that martial men, in fact, may make the best satyagrahis.

Gandhi spent two months with them in autumn of 1938. At that time they had over 100,000 members of the Khudai Khaidmatgars. They were pledged to nonviolence in thought, word and deed. Badshah Khan, as he as affectionately called among his Pathan people, was a devout and loyal Muslim who never missed a namaz or a fast; but Islam for him meant amal, yakeen, muhabhat (work, faith, love), and he deplored the communal tension which prevailed in so many places. " At the back of our quarrels", he said, " is the failure to recognize that all faiths contain enough inspiration for their adherents. The Holy Quran says in so many words that God sends messengers for all peoples, and these messengers are their prophets. Details differ, because each faith takes the flavour of the soil from which it springs".

Because of this Frontier Gandhi the formerly warlike Frontier Province, home of the Pathans became one of the most peaceful safest centres on the campaign, in spite of the Government atrocities there.

SUFFERING FOR THE CAUSE

At Peshawar, the capital of the North-West Frontier Province on April 23rd, 1931, the most brutal and most controversial tragedy took place. The All India Congress Committee had gone there to enquire into the working of the North-West Frontier regulations. They were stopped and the leaders were arrested and a spontaneous hartal was observed all over the city. As the crowds were returning from the jail after the leaders' arrest, two armoured cars full of soldiers came from behind. People were brutally run over. In spite of people killed and wounded, they remained peaceful, but when one armoured car caught fire, the English soldiers fired at the crowd in which there were women and children. Still the crowd did not panic even though there were hepas of wounded and dying lying about.

At one point the government ordered its crack Garhwal Rifles to fire on the crowds. Faced with unarmed men, women and children lying down to be slaughtered, the Garhwalis refused. "You may blow us from your guns,if you like", they told their officers. (Indians in the Great Mutiny of 1857 had been shot from cannon as punishment.) "We shall not shoot our unarmed brethren."

When word of the Garhwalis' heroism got out, it moved all India. The soldiers paid a high price for it. The whole platoon was arrested, and seventeen men were court-martialed and sentenced: one to banishment in an overseas penal colony for life, another to fiteen years' imprisonment, and the rest to rigorous prison terms.

This was one of the most famous regiments in the world, known for their loyalty as well as their courage, and their refusal to obey orders gave the British a chilling reminder of the Great Mutiny. They were determined to check it. Even after an eventual truce freed all of the one hudred thousand political prisoners of the Salt Satyagraha, the Garhwalis were exempted from the general

amnesty and served their full terms. Peshawar itself fell into chaos, as the troops and police tried to quell the demonstrations. One of their first act was to declare the Khudai Khidmatgars illegal and close down their office, scattering all their papers and removing their cash. The Pukhtoon was declared illegal and its publication ceased.

On October 27, 1934, Khan told the Indian Christian Association the story of the savage repression unfolded, Khan's emotions surged and he unveiled his deepest feelings. "What is our fault?", he asked rhetorically :

Our fault is that our province is the gateway of India. Because we live there, the government calls us the gatekeepers and openly tells us, "How can we give reforms to the gatekeeps?" The Britishers regard it as dangerous and think that they will not be able to rule India if the gatekeepers join hands with the Indians. It was for this very reason that our movement was crushed at that very outset....We started our own schools, but the government,under some pretext or other, cleverly ruined the educational institutions of our little children We were born in the Frontier Province and this is why we were doomed. This is our great crime, that we wanted to see the people of the villages civilized in that very Frontier Province which is called the gateway of India, while they wanted that these people should go on fighting among themselves and remain in need of them and remain in a ruined and destoyed condition so that they might rule our country without feeling any anxiety.

What alarmed the British-- and stunned Indians-- was the nonviolence of the Pathans. No one expected it, and the British were clearly unnerved. "The British feared a non-violent Pathan more than a violent one", Khan wrote later. "all the horrors the British perpetrated on the Pathans had only one purpose: to provoke them to violence". Much of the government's extreme behavior during the months that followed can be understood only as attempts to goad the Pathans into breaking their nonviolent vow. If they broke down and retaliated, the British would be back on familiar ground.

The government tried other methods. Martial law was declared in August and the province was placed completely in the hands

of the military. Khudai Khidmatgars were stripped and flogged and made to run the gauntlet through cordons of soldiers and proded them with rifles and bayonets as they passed. One enterprising assistant superintendent, a Mr. Jameson, had volunteers stripped and physically humiliated in public, then thrown into nearby cesspools. For some the strain was too great. They chose sucide rather than break their vow of nonviolence.

The Brtish also tried to subvert the movement by insinuating a Bolshevik influence among the red shirts. An order was sent from the British commissioner to all the village chiefs :

You must prevent Congress volunteers wearing red jackets from entering your villages. The call themselves Khudai Khidmatgars (Servants of God). But in reality they are servants of Gandhi. They were the dress of Bolsheviks. They will create the same atmosphere as you have heard of in the Boshevik dominion.

"The two years that followed", says a Pathan writer,Mohammed Yunnus : formed an astounding period of darkness for the province. Shootings, beatings and other acts of provocation were perpetrated against these people, who had never suffered before without avenging themselves. "Gunning the Red Shirts" was a popular sport and pasttime of the British forces in the province, observed an American tourist.

At Kohat, in the bitter cold of the winter, our men beaten up and later thrown into the icy stream running through the city. It was the same story at Bannu (where the British made an unsuccessful blockade to starve the villagers into submission) and Dera Ismail Khan. The residents of Swabi saw their fields destroyed, their wheat stocks ruined by oil poured upon them.

But the Pathans, notwithstanding the fact that they had been brought up in an atmosphere of violence and bloodshed, stood unmoved by such provocations and died peacefully in large numbers for the attainment of their goal.

"Throwing away one's weapons is not enough," Gandhi empbhasised, "Nonviolence is an active principle of the highest order. It is soul force, the power of Godhead within us." He stepped quickly across the furrows of the cotton field. "We become

Godlike to the extent we realise nonviolence. Even a tiny grain of true nonviolence acts in a silent, subtle and unseen way, and leavens the whole society."

Gandhi said of Badhshah Khan: Whatever the Khudai Khidmatgars may ultimately turn out to be, there can be no doubt about what their leader is. He is unquestionably a man of God. He believes in His living presence and knows that his movement will prosper only if God wills it. Having put his whole soul into his cause, he remins indifferent as to what happens.

When we parted at Taxila, our eyes were wet. The Frontier Province must remain a place of frequent pilgrimage for me. For though the rest of India may fail toshow true nonviolence, there seems to be good ground for hoping that the Frontier Province will pass through the fiery ordeal.

The reason is simple. Badshah Khan commands willing obedience fom his adberents. He has but to say the word, and it is carried out. His nonviolence is no lip service. His whole heart is in it. Let the doubters live with him as I have all these precious five weeks and their doubt will be dissolved like mist before the morning sun.

He never saw a unified India. His Frontier Province was made a part of Pakistan, all his life's efforts ended in abandonment by India.

Gandhi confessed later that he could not bear to see Khan's grief. "His inner agony wrings my heart. But, if I gave way to tears, it would be cowardly, and stalwart Pathan as he is, he would break down. So I go about my business unmoved. That is no small thing."

The two Gandhis said goodbye: " The two aging warriors stood for a long time on the platform and looked at each other: the Hindu Mahatma and the Muslim Fakir wedded in a union of sacrifice and service.

What needed to be said? The understanding had long ago passed beyond words. Their spirits met far above language. They did not knwo when they would meet again--they did not need tro know. They were Khudai Khidmatgars, servants of God. They would serve and God would decide where and how.

Khan watched the express pull out of the station in a burst of steam and clatter. Hundreds of robbed and saried figures swirled around and past him toward the door of the big terminal--and toward freedom. And his Pathans? They would prevail. If they could find out their true strength, it would not matter whether they were part of India or Pakistan.

As for himself, Khan was at peace. His surrender long ago to the will of God shielded him like armour from these setbacks. He had not looked for rest in his life, and he would not start looking now. There was work to do.

Khan glanced up at the large board near the top of the terminal: the day's arrivals and departures. He smiled. An express left for the Frontier in two hours. It was time he got back to his people.

He stepped through the rush of travellers toward the ticket window. The plum orchard behind the farmhouse would have exploded in pink by now, he thought. Its splendor would not last much longer. It was time to go home.

The world mourned the death of this great freedom fighter and India said goodbye to one of the last of these stalwart men who brought India's Independence.

See Appendix 5 for Prerequisite for Satyagraha, Rules for a Satyagrahi, Requisite qualifications for a Satyagrahi, and Qualifications of a Peace Brigade. These points on Satyagraha were formulated by Gandhi for his time. Today we see activists keeping to the spirit of Gandhi but adapting some of the principles to suit or reality. Spinning, amber charkha as a home industry doesn't give a living daily wage, also if you buy the quality of khadi available to ordinary people, it doesnt last as long as synthetic material at comparable prices. So pure Satyagraha today need not include spinning, weaving, or wearing only khadi cloth.

11

Syed Ahmed Khan

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan Bahadur October 17, 1817 - March 27, 1898), commonly known as Sir Syed, was an Indian educator and politician, and an Islamic reformer and modernist. Sir Syed pioneered modern education for the Muslim community in India by founding the Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental College, which later developed into the Aligarh Muslim University. His work gave rise to a new generation of Muslim intellectuals and politicians who composed the Aligarh movement to secure the political future of Muslims in India.

Born into Mughal nobility, Sir Syed earned a reputation as a distinguished scholar while working as a jurist for the British East India Company. During the Indian Rebellion of 1857 he remained loyal to the British and was noted for his actions in saving European lives. After the rebellion he penned the booklet Asbab-e-Bhaghawath-e-Hind (The Causes of the Indian Mutiny) - a daring critique, at the time, of British policies that he blamed for causing the revolt. Believing that the future of Muslims was threatened by the rigidity of their orthodox outlook, Sir Syed began promoting Western-style scientific education by founding modern schools and journals and organising Muslim intellectuals. Towards this goal, Sir Syed founded the Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental College in 1875 with the aim of promoting social and economic development of Indian Muslims.

One of the most influential Muslim politicians of his time, Sir Syed was suspicious of the Indian independence movement and called upon Muslims to loyally serve the British Raj. He denounced nationalist organisations such as the Indian National Congress,

instead forming organisations to promote Muslim unity and pro-British attitudes and activities. Sir Syed promoted the adoption of Urdu as the lingua franca of all Indian Muslims, and mentored a rising generation of Muslim politicians and intellectuals. Although hailed as a great Muslim leader and social reformer, Sir Syed remains the subject of controversy for his views on Hindu-Muslim issues.

EARLY LIFE

Syed Ahmed Khan Bahadur was born in Delhi, then the capital of the Mughal Empire. His family is said to have migrated from Herat (now in Afghanistan) in the time of emperor Akbar, although by other accounts his family descended from Arabia. Many generations of his family had since been highly connected with the Mughal administration. His maternal grandfather Khwaja Fariduddin served as wazir in the court of Akbar Shah II. His paternal grandfather Syed Hadi held a mansab, a high-ranking administrative position and honorary name of Jawwad Ali Khan in the court of Alamgir II. Sir Syed's father Mir Muhammad Muttaqi was personally close to Akbar Shah II and served as his personal adviser. However, Sir Syed was born at a time when rebellious governors, regional insurrections and the British colonialism had diminished the extent and power of the Mughal state, reducing its monarch to a figurehead status. With his elder brother Syed Muhammad Khan, Sir Syed was raised in a large house in a wealthy area of the city. They were raised in strict accordance with Mughal noble traditions and exposed to politics. Their mother Azis-un-Nisa played a formative role in Sir Syed's life, raising him with rigid discipline with a strong emphasis on education. Sir Syed was taught to read and understand the Qur'an by a female tutor, which was unusual at the time. He received an education traditional to Muslim nobility in Delhi.

Under the charge of Maulvi Hamiduddin, Sir Syed was trained in Persian, Arabic, Urdu and religious subjects. He read the works of Muslim scholars and writers such as Sahbai, Rumi and Ghalib. Other tutors instructed him in mathematics, astronomy and Islamic jurisprudence. Sir Syed was also adept at swimming, wrestling and other sports. He took an active part in the Mughal court's

cultural activities. His elder brother founded the city's first printing press in the Urdu language along with the journal Sayyad-ul-Akbar. Sir Syed pursued the study of medicine for several years, but did not complete the prescribed course of study.

Until the death of his father in 1838, Sir Syed had lived a life customary for an affluent young Muslim noble. Upon his father's death, he inherited the titles of his grandfather and father and was awarded the title of Arif Jung by the emperor Bahadur Shah Zafar. Financial difficulties put an end to Sir Syed's formal education, although he continued to study in private, using books on a variety of subjects. Sir Syed assumed editorship of his brother's journal and rejected offers of employment from the Mughal court. Having recognised the steady decline in Mughal political power, Sir Syed entered the British East India Company's civil service. He was appointed serestadar at the courts of law in Agra, responsible for record-keeping and managing court affairs. In 1840, he was promoted to the title of munshi.

SCHOLARLY WORKS

While continuing to work as a jurist, Sir Syed began focusing on writing on various subjects, mainly in Urdu. His career as an author began when he published a series of treatises in Urdu on religious subjects in 1842. He published the book Athar Assanadid (Great Monuments) documenting antiquities of Delhi dating from the medieval era. This work earned him the reputation of a cultured scholar. In 1842, he completed the Jila-ul-Qulub bi Zikr il Mahbub and the Tuhfa-i-Hasan, along with the Tahsil fi jar-i-Saqil in 1844. These works focused on religious and cultural subjects. In 1852, he published the two works Namiqa dar bayan masala tasawwur-i-Shaikh and Silsilat ul-Mulk. He released the second edition of Athar Assanadid in 1854. He also penned a commentary on the Bible - the first by a Muslim - in which he argued that Islam was the closest religion to Christianity, with a common lineage from Abrahamic religions.

Acquainted with high-ranking British officials, Sir Syed obtained close knowledge about British colonial politics during his service at the courts. At the outbreak of the Indian rebellion, on May 10, 1857, Sir Syed was serving as the chief assessment

officer at the court in Bijnor. Northern India became the scene of the most intense fighting. The conflict had left large numbers of civilians dead. Erstwhile centres of Muslim power such as Delhi, Agra, Lucknow and Kanpur were severely affected. Sir Syed was personally affected by the violence and the ending of the Mughal dynasty amongst many other long-standing kingdoms. Sir Syed and many other Muslims took this as a defeat of Muslim society. He lost several close relatives who died in the violence. Although he succeeded in rescuing his mother from the turmoil, she died in Meerut, owing to the privations she had experienced.

In 1858, he was appointed to a high-ranking post at the court in Muradabad, where he began working on his most famous literary work. Publishing the booklet Asbab-e-Bhaghawath-e-Hind in 1859, Sir Syed studied the causes of the revolt. In this, his most famous work, he rejected the common notion that the conspiracy was planned by Muslim élites, who were insecure at the diminishing influence of Muslim monarchs. Sir Syed blamed the British East India Company for its aggressive expansion as well as the ignorance of British politicians regarding Indian culture. However, he gained respect for British power, which he felt would dominate India for a long period of time. Seeking to rehabilitate Muslim political influence, Sir Syed advised the British to appoint Muslims to assist in administration. His other writings such as Loyal Muhammadans of India, Tabyin-ul-Kalam and A Series of Essays on the Life of Muhammad and Subjects Subsidiary Therein helped to create cordial relations between the British authorities and the Muslim community.

MUSLIM REFORMER

Through the 1850s, Syed Ahmed Khan began developing a strong passion for education. While pursuing studies of different subjects including European jurisprudence, Sir Syed began to realise the advantages of Western-style education, which was being offered at newly-established colleges across India. Despite being a devout Muslim, Sir Syed criticised the influence of traditional dogma and religious orthodoxy, which had made most Indian Muslims suspicious of British influences. Sir Syed began feeling increasingly concerned for the future of Muslim

communities. A scion of Mughal nobility, Sir Syed had been reared in the finest traditions of Muslim élite culture and was aware of the steady decline of Muslim political power across India. The animosity between the British and Muslims before and after the rebellion (Independence War) of 1857 threatened to marginalise Muslim communities across India for many generations. Sir Syed intensified his work to promote co-operation with British authorities, promoting loyalty to the Empire amongst Indian Muslims. Committed to working for the upliftment of Muslims, Sir Syed founded a modern madrassa in Muradabad in 1859; this was one of the first religious schools to impart scientific education. Sir Syed also worked on social causes, helping to organise relief for the famine-struck people of the Northwest Frontier Province in 1860. He established another modern school in Ghazipur in 1863.

Upon his transfer to Aligarh in 1864, Sir Syed began working wholeheartedly as an educator. He founded the Scientific Society of Aligarh, the first scientific association of its kind in India. Modelling it after the Royal Society and the Royal Asiatic Society, Sir Syed assembled Muslim scholars from different parts of the country. The Society held annual conferences, disbursed funds for educational causes and regularly published a journal on scientific subjects in English and Urdu. Sir Syed felt that the socio-economic future of Muslims was threatened by their orthodox aversions to modern science and technology. He published many writings promoting liberal, rational interpretations of Islamic scriptures. However, his view of Islam was rejected by Muslim clergy as contrary to traditional views on issues like jihad, polygamy and animal slaughtering.

ADVOCACY OF URDU

The onset of the Hindi-Urdu controversy of 1867 saw the emergence of Sir Syed as a political leader of the Muslim community. He became a leading Muslim voice opposing the adoption of Hindi as a second official language of the United Provinces (now Uttar Pradesh). Sir Syed perceived Urdu as the lingua franca of Muslims. Having been developed by Muslim rulers of India, Urdu was used as a secondary language to Persian,

the official language of the Mughal court. Since the decline of the Mughal dynasty, Sir Syed promoted the use of Urdu through his own writings. Under Sir Syed, the Scientific Society translated Western works only into Urdu. The schools established by Sir Syed imparted education in the Urdu medium. The demand for Hindi, led largely by Hindus, was to Sir Syed an erosion of the centuries-old Muslim cultural domination of India. Testifying before the British-appointed education commission, Sir Syed controversially exclaimed that "Urdu was the language of gentry and Hindi that of the vulgar." His remarks provoked a hostile response from Hindu leaders, who unified across the nation to demand the recognition of Hindi.

The success of the Hindi movement led Sir Syed to further advocate Urdu as the symbol of Muslim heritage and as the language of all Indian Muslims. His educational and political work grew increasingly centred around and exclusively for Muslim interests. He also sought to persuade the British to give Urdu extensive official use and patronage. His colleagues and protégés such as Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Maulvi Abdul Haq developed organisations such as the Urdu Defence Association and the Anjuman Taraqqi-i-Urdu, committed to the perpetuation of Urdu. Sir Syed's protégé Shibli Nomani led efforts that resulted in the adoption of Urdu as the official language of the Hyderabad State and as the medium of instruction in the Osmania University. To Muslims in northern and western India, Urdu had became an integral part of political and cultural identity. However, the division over the use of Hindi or Urdu further provoked communal conflict between Muslims and Hindus in India.

FOUNDING ALIGARH

On April 1, 1869 Sir Syed travelled to England, where he was awarded the Order of the Star of India from the British government on August 6. Travelling across England, he visited its colleges and was inspired by the culture of learning established after the Renaissance. Sir Syed returned to India in the following year determined to build a "Muslim Cambridge." Upon his return, he organised the "Committee for the Better Diffusion and Advancement of Learning among Muhammadans" (Muslims) on

December 26, 1870. Sir Syed described his vision of the institution he proposed to establish in an article written sometime in 1872 and re-printed in the Aligarh Institute Gazette of April 5, 1911:

I may appear to be dreaming and talking like Shaikh Chilli, but we aim to turn this MAO College into a University similar to that of Oxford or Cambridge. Like the churches of Oxford and Cambridge, there will be mosques attached to each College… The College will have a dispensary with a Doctor and a compounder, besides a Unani Hakim. It will be mandatory on boys in residence to join the congregational prayers (namaz) at all the five times. Students of other religions will be exempted from this religious observance. Muslim students will have a uniform consisting of a black alpaca, half-sleeved chugha and a red Fez cap… Bad and abusive words which boys generally pick up and get used to, will be strictly prohibited. Even such a word as a "liar" will be treated as an abuse to be prohibited. They will have food either on tables of European style or on chaukis in the manner of the Arabs… Smoking of cigarette or huqqa and the chewing of betels shall be strictly prohibited. No corporal punishment or any such punishment as is likely to injure a student's self-respect will be permissible… It will be strictly enforced that Shia and Sunni boys shall not discuss their religious differences in the College or in the boarding house. At present it is like a day dream. I pray to God that this dream may come true."

By 1873, the committee under Sir Syed issued proposals for the construction of a college in Aligarh. He began publishing the journal Tahzib al-Akhlaq (Social Reformer) to spread awareness and knowledge on modern subjects and promote reforms in Muslim society. Sir Syed worked to promote reinterpretation of Muslim ideology in order to reconcile tradition with Western education. He argued in several books on Islam that the Qur'an rested on an appreciation of reason and natural law, making scientific inquiry important to being a good Muslim. Sir Syed established a modern school in Aligarh and, obtaining support from wealthy Muslims and the British, laid the foundation stone of the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College on May 24, 1875.

He retired from his career as a jurist the following year, concentrating entirely on developing the college and on religious reform. Sir Syed's pioneering work received support from the British. Although intensely criticised by orthodox religious leaders hostile to modern influences, Sir Syed's new institution attracted a large student body, mainly drawn from the Muslim gentry and middle classes. The curriculum at the college involved scientific and Western subjects, as well as Oriental subjects and religious education. The first chancellor was Sultan Shah Jahan Begum, a prominent Muslim noblewoman, and Sir Syed invited an Englishman, Theodore Beck, to serve as the first college principal. The college was originally affiliated with Calcutta University but was transferred to the Allahabad University in 1885. Near the turn of the 20th century, it began publishing its own magazine and established a law school. In 1920, the college was transformed into a university.

POLITICAL CAREER

In 1878, Sir Syed was nominated to the Viceroy's Legislative Council. He testified before the education commission to promote the establishment of more colleges and schools across India. In the same year, Sir Syed founded the Muhammadan Association to promote political co-operation amongst Indian Muslims from different parts of the country. In 1886, he organised the All India Muhammadan Educational Conference in Aligarh, which promoted his vision of modern education and political unity for Muslims. His works made him the most prominent Muslim politician in 19th century India, often influencing the attitude of Muslims on various national issues. He supported the efforts of Indian political leaders Surendranath Banerjea and Dadabhai Naoroji to obtain representation for Indians in the government and civil services. In 1883, he founded the Muhammadan Civil Service Fund Association to encourage and support the entry of Muslim graduates into the Indian Civil Service (ICS).

However, Sir Syed's political views were shaped by a strong aversion to the emerging nationalist movement, which was composed largely of Hindus. Sir Syed opposed the Indian National Congress (created in 1885) on the grounds that it was a Hindu-majority organisation, calling on Muslims to stay away from it. While fearful of the loss of Muslim political power owing to the

community's backwardness, Sir Syed was also averse to the prospect of democratic self-government, which would give control of government to the Hindu-majority population:

"At this time our nation is in a bad state in regards education and wealth, but God has given us the light of religion and the Koran is present for our guidance, which has ordained them and us to be friends. Now God has made them rulers over us. Therefore we should cultivate friendship with them, and should adopt that method by which their rule may remain permanent and firm in India, and may not pass into the hands of the Bengalis… If we join the political movement of the Bengalis our nation will reap a loss, for we do not want to become subjects of the Hindus instead of the subjects of the "people of the Book…"

His fierce criticism of the Congress and Indian nationalists created rifts between Muslims and Hindus. At the same time, Sir Syed sought to politically ally Muslims to the British government. An avowed loyalist of the British Empire, Sir Syed was nominated as a member of the Civil Service Commission in 1887 by Lord Dufferin. In 1888, he established the United Patriotic Association at Aligarh to promote political co-operation with the British and Muslim participation in the government. Syed Ahmed Khan was knighted by the British government in 1888 and in the following year he received an LL.D. honoris causa from the Edinburgh University.

LEGACY

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan lived the last two decades of his life in Aligarh, regarded widely as the mentor of 19th- and 20th century Muslim intellectuals and politicians. He remained the most influential Muslim politician in India, with his opinions guiding the convictions of a large majority of Muslims. Battling illnesses and old age, Sir Syed died on March 27, 1898. He was buried besides Sir Syed Masjid inside the campus of the Aligarh university. His funeral was attended by thousands of students, Muslim leaders and British officials. Sir Syed is widely commemorated across South Asia as a great Muslim reformer and visionary. The university he founded remains one of India's most prominent institutions. Prominent alumni of Aligarh include

Muslim political leaders Maulana Mohammad Ali, Abdur Rab Nishtar, Maulana Shaukat Ali and Maulvi Abdul Haq, who is hailed in Pakistan as Baba-e-Urdu (Father of Urdu). The first two Prime Ministers of Pakistan, Liaquat Ali Khan and Khawaja Nazimuddin, as well as the late Indian President Dr. Zakir Hussain, are amongst Aligarh's most famous graduates. In India, Sir Syed is commemorated as a pioneer who worked for the socio-political upliftment of Indian Muslims, though his views on Hindu-Muslim issues are a subject of controversy. Sir Syed is also hailed as a founding father of Pakistan for his role in developing a Muslim political class independent of Hindu-majority organisations. The Sir Syed University of Engineering and Technology was established in honour of Sir Syed in Karachi and is a leading technical institution in Pakistan.

CRITICISM

During his lifetime and in contemporary times, Sir Syed was criticised for encouraging communal divisions between Hindus and Muslims. He is identified by historians as one of the earliest advocates of the Two-Nation Theory - that Hindus and Muslims were distinct and incompatible nations. Historians argue that Sir Syed was emotionally unable to accept the prospect that an independent India's Hindu-majority would come to rule Muslims, who had been the erstwhile colonial rulers. He also feared that Hindu culture would diminish the Perso-Arabic nature of Muslim culture, which had enjoyed a dominant status under Muslim rulers for centuries. His condemnation of Indian nationalists and profession of the incompatibility of Muslims and Hindus widened the socio-political gulf between the communities that had emerged with the Urdu-Hindi controversy. At the same time, Sir Syed was intensely criticised by religious Muslims who regarded his liberal reinterpretation of Islamic scripture as blasphemy.

Supporters of Sir Syed contend that his political vision gave an independent political expression to the Muslim community, which aided its goal to secure political power in India. His philosophy guided the creation of the All India Muslim League in 1906, as a political party separate from the Congress. Sir Syed's ideas inspired both the liberal, pro-British politicians of the Muslim

League and the religious ideologues of the Khilafat struggle. The Muslim League remained at odds with the Congress and continued to advocate the boycott of the Indian independence movement. In the 1940s, the student body of Aligarh committed itself to the establishment of Pakistan and contributed in a large measure in the activities of the Muslim League. Sir Syed's patronage of Urdu led to its widespread use amongst Indian Muslim communities and following the Partition of India its adoption as an official language in Pakistan.

Just after the Mutiny of 1857, Syed Ahmad Khan wrote Asbab-e-Baghawat-e-Hind (Causes of the Indian Revolt), pointing out the weaknesses of the British Government. When the House of Commons discussed the pamphlet Mr Sale Beadon, the Foreign Secretary, vehemently opposed it and asked the Government to imprison such a revolutionary writer. But Parliament did not support him. On the contrary, most of the British papers supported the views of Syed Ahmad and advised the Government to act upon the valuable recommendations made by him. In 1873 the pamphlet was translated into English by Sir Auckland Colvin and Lieut. Colonel Graham and appeared as the Causes of the Indian Revolt. (Abridged)

The primary causes of rebellion are, I fancy, everywhere the same. It invariably results from the existence of a policy obnoxious to the dispositions, aims, habits, and views of those by whom the rebellion is brought about.,.

As regards the Rebellion of 1857, the fact is, that for a long period many grievances had been rankling in the hearts of the people. In course of time, a vast store of explosive material had been collected. It wanted but the application of a match to light it, and that match was applied by the mutinous army. . .

The manner in which the rebellion spread, first here, then there, now breaking out in this place and now in that, is alone good proof that there existed no widespread conspiracy.

Nor is there the slightest reason for thinking that the rebels in Hindustan received any aid from Russia or from Persia. The Hindustanees have no conception of the views of Russia, and it is not probable that they would league themselves with her.

Nor can I think that they would ever be likely to receive any help from Persia. As between Roman Catholics and Protestants, so between the Mussulman of Persia and of Hindustan, cordial cooperation is impossible. To me it seems just as credible that night and day should be merged in one, as that these men should ever act in concert. Surely, if such were the case, it is very strange that during the Russian and Persian wars, Hindustan should have remained completely tranquil. Nor, on the other hand, is it less strange that while Hindustan was in flames, there should have been in those countries no visible stir whatever. The notion of an understanding existing between these countries must be set aside as preposterous. . .

I see nothing strange in the fact, if fact it were, of the ex-king of Delhi having written a Farman[1] to the Persians. Such an imbecile was the ex-king, that had one assured him that the angels of heaven were his slaves, he would have welcomed the assurance, and would have caused half-a-dozen Farmansto be prepared immediately. The ex-king had a fixed idea that he could transform himself into a fly or gnat, and that he could in this guise convey himself to other countries, and learn what was going on there. Seriously, he firmly believed that he possessed the power of transformation. He was in the habit of asking his courtiers in Durbar if it were not so, and his courtiers were not the men to undeceive him. Is there anything wonderful in the fact of such a dotard writing a Farman to any person, or at any man's instigation? Surely not. But it is perfectly incredible that such a Farman should have formed the basis of any league.

Strange that such wide conspiracies should have been for so long hatching, and that none of our rulers should have been aware of them! After the revolt had broken out, no volunteer, whether soldier or civilian, ever alluded to such a thing; and yet had any league existed, there could then have no longer been any reason for concealing it.

Nor do I believe that the annexation of Oudh[2] was the cause of this rebellion. No doubt men of all classes were irritated at its annexation; all agreed in thinking that the Honourable East India Company had acted in defiance of its treaties, and in contempt of the word which it had pledged. The people of Oudh felt on this

occasion much as other men have felt whose countries have been annexed by the East India Company. Of this, however, more hereafter. But what I mean here is, that the men who would be the most irritated and dismayed at such a step, were the noblemen and independent princes of Hindustan. These all saw that sooner or later such a policy must lead to the overthrow of their own independence, and confiscation of their own lands. Nevertheless we find that there was not one of the great landed princes who espoused the rebel cause. The mutineers were for the most part men who had nothing to lose-the governed, not the governing class. To cite in contradiction of what I say the cases of the Nawab of Jhujjar and the Rajah of Bulubgarh, and other such petty feudatories, would show little else than ignorance of the status of the various Hindustanee chiefs...

There are, again, no grounds for supposing that the Mohammedans had for a long time been conspiring or plotting a simultaneous rise or a religious crusade against the professors of a different faith. The English Government does not interfere with the Mohammedans in the practice of their religion. For this sole reason it is impossible that the idea of religious crusade should have been entertained. Thirty-five years ago a celebrated Moulvie, Mohammad Ismael[3] by name, preached a religious crusade in

Hindustan, and called upon all men to aid him in carrying it out. But on that occasion he distinctly stated that natives of Hindustan, subject to the British Government, could not conscientiously take part in a religious war within the limits of Hindustan. Accordingly, while thousands of Jehadees[4] congregated in every district of Hindustan, there was no sort of disturbance raised within British territory. Going northwards, these men crossed the Panjab frontier, and waged war in those parts of the country. And even if we should imitate the know-nothings in the various districts and call the late disturbance a religious war, it is very certain that no preparations were made for it before the 10th of May 1857...

I do not found my belief on any speculative grounds or any favourite theory of my own. For centuries, many able and thoughtful men have concurred in the views I am about to express.

All treatises and works on the principles of government bear me out. All histories either of the one or the other hemisphere are witnesses to the soundness of my opinions.

Most men, I believe, agree in thinking that it is highly conducive to the welfare and prosperity of Government-indeed is essential to its stability-that the people should have a voice in its councils. It is from the voice of the people only that Government can learn whether its projects are likely to be well received. The voice of the people can alone check errors in the bud, and warn us of dangers before they burst upon and destroy us.

A needle may dam the gushing rivulet: an elephant must turn aside from the swollen torrent. This voice, however, can never be heard, and this security never acquired, unless the people are allowed a share in the consultations of Government. The men who have ruled India should never have forgotten that they were here in the position of foreigners-that they differed from its natives in religion, in customs, in habits of life and of thought.

The security of a Government, it will be remembered, is founded on its knowledge of the character of the governed, as well as on its careful observance of their rights and privileges. Look back at the pages of history, the record of the experience of the past, and you will not fail to be struck with the differences and distinctions that have existed between the manners, the opinions, and the customs of the various races of men-differences which have been acquired by no written rule, or prescribed by any printed form. They are in every instance the inheritance of the peculiar race. It is to these differences of thought and of custom that the laws must be adapted, for they cannot be adapted to the laws. In their due observance lies the welfare and security of government. From the beginning of things, to disregard these has been to disregard the nature of man, and the neglected of them has ever been the cause of universal discontent.

The evils which resulted to India from the non-admission of natives into the Legislative Council of India were various. Government could never know the inadvisability of the laws and regulations which it passed. It could never hear as it ought to have heard the voice of the people on such a subject. The people had no means of protesting against what they might feel to be a foolish

measure, or of giving public expression to their own wishes. But the greatest mischief lay in this, that the people misunderstood the views and the intentions of Government. They misapprehended every act, and whatever law was passed was misconstrued by men who had no share in the framing of it, and hence no means of judging of its spirit. At length the Hindustanees fell into the habit of thinking that all the laws were passed with a view to degrade and ruin them, and to deprive them and their fellows of their religion. Such acts as were repugnant to native customs and character, whether in themselves good or bad, increased this suspicion. At last came the time when all men looked upon the English Government as slow poison, a rope of sand, a treacherous flame of fire.

They learned to think that if to-day they escaped from the hands of Government, tomorrow they would fall into them; or that even if they escaped the morrow, the third day would see their ruin. There was no man to reason with them, no one to point out to them the absurdity of such ideas. When the governors and the governed occupy relatively such a position as this, what hope is there of loyalty or of goodwill? Granted that the intentions of Government were excellent, there was no man who could convince the people of it; no one was at hand to correct the errors which they had adopted. And why? Because there was not one of their own number among the members of the Legislative Council. Had there been, these evils that have happened to us would have been averted. The more one thinks the matter over, the more one is convinced that here we have the one great cause which was the origin of all smaller causes of dissatisfaction. .

I do not wish to enter here into the question as to how the ignorant and uneducated natives of Hindustan could be allowed a share in the deliberations of the Legislative Council, or as to how they should be selected to form an assembly like the English Parliament. These are knotty points. All I wish to prove here is, that such a step is not only advisable, but absolutely necessary, and that the disturbances are due to the neglect of such a measure. As regards the details of the question I have elsewhere discussed them, and those who wish to enter into it can read what I have said.

This mistake of the Government, then, made itself felt in every matter connected with Hindustan. All causes of rebellion, however various, can be traced to this one. And if we look at these various causes separately and distinctly, we shall, I think, find that they may be classed under five heads:

1. Ignorance on the part of the people; by which I mean misapprehension of the intentions of Government.
2. The passing of such laws and regulations and forms of procedure as jarred with the established customs and practice of Hindustan, and the introduction of such as were in themselves objectionable.
3. Ignorance on the part of the Government of the condition of the people, of their modes of thought and of life, and of the grievances through which their hearts were becoming estranged.
4. The neglect on the part of our rulers of such points as were essential to the good government of Hindustan.
5. The bad management and disaffection of the army. . .

I would here say that I do not wish it to be understood that the views of Government were in reality such as have been imputed to them. I only wish to say that they were misconstrued by the people, and that this misconstruction hurried on the rebellion. Had there been a native of Hindustan in the Legislative Council, the people would never have fallen into such errors.

Interference in Matters of Religion: There is not the smallest doubt that all men, whether ignorant or well-informed, whether high or low, felt a firm conviction that the English Government was bent on interfering with their religion, and with their old established customs. They believed that Government intended to force the Christian religion and foreign customs upon Hindu and Mussulman alike. This was the chief among the secondary causes of the rebellion. It was believed by every one that Government was slowly but surely developing its plans. Every step, it was thought, was being taken with the most extreme caution. Hence it is that men said that Government does not speak of proselytising Mohammedans summarily and by force; but it will throw off the veil as it feels itself stronger, and will act with greater decision.

Events, as I shall presently show, increased and strengthened this conviction. Men never thought that our Government would openly compel them to change their religion.

The idea was, that indirect steps would be taken, such as doing away with the study of Arabic and Sanskrit, and reducing the people to ignorance and poverty. In this way, it was supposed, the people would be deprived of a knowledge of the principles of their own faith, and their attention turned to books containing the principles of the Christian creed. It was supposed that Government would then work on the cupidity and poverty of its subjects, and, on condition of their abjuring their faith, offer them employment in its own service.

In the year 1837, the year of the great drought, the step which was taken of rearing orphans in the principles of the Christian faith, was looked upon throughout the North-West Provinces as an example of the schemes of Government. It was supposed that when Government had similarly brought all Hindustanees to a pitch of ignorance and poverty, it would convert them to its own creed. The Hindustanees used, as I have said, to feel an increasing dismay at the annexation of each successive country by the Honourable East India Company. But I assert without fear of contradiction that this feeling arose solely from the belief in their minds, that as the power of Government increased, and there no longer remained foreign enemies to fight against, or internal troubles to quell, it would turn its attention inwards, and carry out a more systematic interference with their creed and religious observances.

In the first days of British rule in Hindustan, there used to be less talk than at present on the subject of religion. Discussion on this point has been increasing day by day, and has now reached its climax. I do not say that Government has interfered in these matters; but it has been the general opinion that all that was done was according to the instructions and hints of Government, and was by no means displeasing to it. It has been commonly believed that Government appointed missionaries and maintained them at its own cost. It has been supposed that Government, and the officers of Government throughout the country, were in the habit of giving large sums of money to these missionaries, with the

intention of covering their expenses, enabling them to distribute books, and in every way aiding them. Many covenanted officers and many military men have been in the habit of talking to their subordinates about religion; some of them would bid their servants come to their houses and listen to the preaching of missionaries, and thus it happened that in the course of time no man felt sure that his creed would last even his own lifetime.

The missionaries, moreover, introduced a new system of preaching. They took to printing and circulating controversial tracts, in the shape of questions and answers. Men of a different faith were spoken of in those tracts in a most offensive and irritating way. In Hindustan these things have always been managed very differently. Every man in this country preaches and explains his views in his own mosque or his own house.

If any one wishes to listen to him, he can go to the mosque or house and hear what he has to say. But the missionaries' plan was exactly the opposite. They used to attend places of public resort-markets, for instance, and fairs, where men of different creeds were collected together-and used to begin preaching there. It was only from fear of the authorities that no one bade them be off about their business. In some districts the missionaries were actually attended by policemen from the station. And then the missionaries did not confine themselves to explaining the doctrines of their own books. In violent and unmeasured language they attacked the followers and the holy places of other creeds, annoying and insulting beyond expression the feelings of those who listened to them. In this way, too, the seeds of discontent were sown deep in the hearts of the people.

Then missionary schools were started in which the principles of the Christian faith were taught. Men said it was by the order of Government. In some districts covenanted officers of high position and of great influence used to visit the schools and encourage the people to attend them; examinations were held in books which taught the tenets of the Christian religion. Lads who attended the schools used to be asked such questions as the following, 'Who is your God?' 'Who is your Redeemer,' and these questions they were obliged to answer agreeably to the Christian belief-prizes being given accordingly. This again added to the

prevailing ill-will. But it may be said with some justice, 'If the people were not satisfied with this course of education, why did they let their children go to the schools?' The fact is, that we have here no question of like or dislike. On the contrary, we must account for this by the painfully degraded and ignorant state of the people. They believed that if their children were entered at the schools, they might have employment given them by Government, and be enabled to find some means of subsistence. Hence they put up with a state of affairs in reality disagreeable enough to them. But it must not be thought that they ever liked those schools.

When the village schools were established, the general belief was that they were instituted solely with the view of teaching the doctrines of Jesus. The pergunnah visitors and deputy inspectors who used to go from village to village and town to town advising the people to enter their children at these schools, got the nickname of native clergymen. When the pergunnah visitor or deputy inspector entered any village, the people used to say that the native clergyman had come. Their sole idea was, that these were Christian schools, established with the view of converting them. Well-informed men, although they did not credit this, saw nevertheless that in these schools nothing but Urdu was taught. They were afraid that boys while reading only Urdu would forget the tenets of their own faith, and that they would thus drift into Christianity. They believed, also, that Government wished such books as bore upon the doctrines of the former religions of Hindustan to fall into entire disuse. This was to be done with the view of ensuring the spread of Christianity. In many of the eastern districts of Hindustan where these schools were established, boys were entered at them by compulsion, and by compulsion only. It was currently reported, that all this was in pursuance of the orders of Government.

There was at the same time a great deal of talk in Hindustan about female education. Men believed it to be the wish of Government that girls should attend and be taught at these schools, and leave off the habit of sitting veiled. Anything more obnoxious than this to the feelings of the Hindustanees cannot be conceived. In some districts the practice was actually introduced. The

pergunnah visitors and deputy inspectors hoped, by enforcing the attendance of girls, to gain credit with their superior. In every way, therefore, right or wrong, they tried to carry out their object. Here, then, was another cause of discontent among the people, through which they became confirmed in error.

The large colleges established in the towns were from the first a source of suspicion. At the time of their establishment Shah Abdulazeez, a celebrated Moulvie of Hindustan, was alive. The Mohammedans asked him for a Fatwa on the subject. His answer was distinct. 'Go,' he said, 'read in the English colleges, and learn the English tongue. The laws of Islam admit it.' Acting on this opinion the Mohammedans did not hesitate to enter these colleges. At that time, however, the colleges were conducted on a principle widely different from that which is at present adopted. Arabic, Persian, Sanskrit, and English were equally taught. The 'Fickah,' 'Hadees,' and other such books were read. Examinations were held in the 'Fickah' for which certificates of proficiency were given. Religion was not in any way thrust forward.

The professors were men of worth and weight-all scholars of great reputation, wide knowledge, and sound moral character. But all this had been changed. The study of Arabic is little thought of. The 'Fickah' and 'Hadees' were suddenly dropped. Persian is almost entirely neglected. Books and methods of teaching have been changed. But the study of Urdu and of English has greatly increased. All this has tended to strengthen the idea that Government wished to wipe out the religions which it found in Hindustan. The professors are no longer men of weight or acquirements. Students at the college, in whom people have not gained confidence, have for some time past been appointed professors. And hence it is that throughout the country these colleges have fallen into disrepute.

Such was the state of the village schools and the colleges, such the general feeling of distrust throughout the country as to the views of Government about conversion, when a proclamation was issued by Government to the following effect: Whoever had studied and passed an examination in certain sciences and in the English language, and had received a certificate to that effect, was to be considered as having prior claims for employment in the

public service. Petty appointments were granted on the production of certificates from the deputy inspectors-the very men who had hitherto been nicknamed native clergymen. This came as a blow to every one. Suspicion increased tenfold. The rumour again arose that Government wished to deprive the Hindustanees of all means of subsistence and by impoverishing them gradually, to substitute its own religion in the place of theirs. . . . In 1855 E. Edward, a missionary, issued a circular and sent it to all Government offices that all people should embrace one faith as there is unity everywhere.

The laws providing for the resumption of revenue free lands, the last of which was Regulation 6 of 1819, were most obnoxious. Nothing disgusted the natives of this country more with the English Government than this resumption of revenue free lands. Sir T. Munro and the Duke of Wellington said truly enough that to resume lands granted revenue free, was to set the whole people against us, and to make beggars of the masses. I cannot describe the odium and the hatred which this act brought on Government, or the extent to which it beggared the people.

Many lands which had been held revenue free for centuries were suddenly resumed on the flimsiest pretexts. The people said that Government not only did nothing for them itself, but undid what former Governments had done. This measure altogether lost for the Government the confidence of its subjects. It may be said that, if revenue free lands were not resumed, some other source of income would have to be sought, or some new tax imposed to meet the charges of Government; so that the people would have still to bear the burden. This may be so; but the people do not see it. It is a remarkable fact that wherever the rebels have issued proclamations to deceive and reduce the people, they have only mentioned two things: the one, interference in matters of religion; the other, the resumption of revenue free lands. It seems fair to infer that these were the two chief causes of the public discontent. More especially was it the case with the Mohammedans, on whom this grievance fell far more heavily than on the Hindus.

Under former rules and in old times, the system of buying and selling rights in landed property, of mortgage, and of transfer by gift, undoubtedly prevailed. But there was little of it, and what

little there was, was due to the consent and wishes of the parties concerned. To arbitrarily compel the sale of these rights in satisfaction of arrears of revenue, or of debt, was a practice in those days unknown. Hindustanee landlords are particularly attached to this kind of property. The loss of their estates has been to them a source of the deepest annoyance. A landed estate in Hindustan is very like a little kingdom. It has always been the practice to elect one man as the head over all. By him matters requiring discussion are brought forward, and every shareholder in proportion to his holding has the power of speaking out his mind on the point. The cultivators and the Chowdries of the villages attend on such an occasion, and say whatever they have to say. Any matter of unusual importance is settled by the headmen of some of the larger villages. You have here, in fact, in great perfection, a miniature kingdom and parliament. These landlords were indignant at the loss of their estate, as a king at the loss of his empire.

But the Government acted in utter disregard of the state of things formerly existing. Dating from the commencement of English rule to the present time, there is probably not a single village in which there have not been more or less transfers. In the first days of British rule, sales of landed property were so numerous that the whole country was turned upside down. To remedy this, Government passed the law which is called Regulation 1 of 1821, and appointed a Commission of Inquiry. This Commission, however, gave rise to a thousand other evils. Finally, the affair was not brought to a satisfactory conclusion, and at last the Commission was abolished. I shall not here enter into the question as to how Government could ensure the payment of the land revenue, if it gave up the practice of sales or its right to enforce sales as arising from the fact of the land being pledged for the payment of revenue. All that I now say is, that whether this system of sales was the result of necessity or of ignorance, it has at all events had a hand in bringing on the rebellion. . . . I will only mention here that it is open to grave doubt whether the land is pledged for the payment of revenue. The claim of the Government lies, I take it, upon the produce of the land, not upon the land itself.

So, too, the practice of sale in satisfaction of debt has been most objectionable. Bankers and money-lenders have availed themselves of it to advance money to landlords, resorting to every kind of trickery and roguery to rob them of their property. They have instituted suits without end in the civil courts-some fraudulent, some correct enough. The consequence has been, that they have very generally ousted the old landlords, and insinuated themselves into their properties. Troubles of this kind have ruined landlords throughout the length and breadth of the land...

There is no doubt that Government were but slightly acquainted with the unhappy state of the people. How could it well be otherwise? There was no real communication between the governors and the governed, no living together or near one another, as has always been the custom of the Mohammedans in countries which they subjected to their rule. Government and its officials have never adopted this course, without which no real knowledge of the people can be gained. It is, however, not easy to see how this can be done by the English, as they almost all look forward to retirement in their native land, and seldom settle for good amongst the natives of India.

The people again, having no voice in the government of the country, could not well better their condition; and if they did try to make themselves heard by means of petitions, these same petitions were seldom if ever attended to, and sometimes never even heard.

Government, it is true, received reports from its subordinate officials; but even these officials themselves were ignorant of the real thoughts and opinions of the people, because they had no means of getting at them. The behaviour of these subordinates as a rule, their pride, and their treatment of natives, is well known. In their presence native gentlemen were afraid, and if they had told these officials of their want of knowledge of the people of their districts, they would only have been summarily ejected for their pains. All the Amlah (readers and clerks) and the civil functionaries, as well as wealthy native gentlemen, were afraid, and consequently did nothing but flatter.

Now Government, although in name only a Government subordinate to a higher Government, was in reality the real

Government of this country, and as such it ought to have received the complaints and petitions of its people direct, and not, as it did, invariably by reports from its district officers. These are some of the reasons why the real feelings and ways of its people, why the action of new laws passed for that people, their working for good or for bad, for the prosperity or otherwise of the countrymen, were unknown, or only slightly known, to Government. The people were isolated, they had no champion to stand up for their rights and to see justice done to them, and they were constrained to weep in silence.

I feel it most necessary to say that which is in my heart, and which I believe to be true, even at the risk of its being distasteful to many of the ruling race. What I am now going to treat of is that which, if only done in a right way, will attract even wild animals, causing them to love instead of to dread, and which, therefore, will, in a much greater degree, attract men. I cannot here state at length what the benefits of friendship, intercourse, and sympathy are; but I maintain that the maintenance of friendly relations between the governors and the governed is far more necessary than between individuals: private friendships only affect a few, friendship and good feeling between a Government and its subjects affect a nation.

As in private friendships two persons are united by the bond of a common friendship, so also should a Government and its people be knit together in like manner. The People and the Government I may liken to a tree, the latter being the root, and the former the growth of that root. As the root is, so will the tree be. What! Was such intimacy impossible under this Government? Most certainly not. We have numerous instances in which foreigners and natives of countries have been brought in contact with each other, and of their becoming friends, even when their religions and countries were different and widely separated. And why was this? Just because they wished, and did their utmost, to become so. How often do we not see strifes and enmities between people of the same race, religion, and customs! Friendship, intercourse, and sympathy are therefore not wholly dependent for their existence merely on the givers and recipients being of the same religion, race, or country.

Does not the Apostle Paul admonish us in these beautiful words?-'And the Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you' (1st Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, iii. 12) And does not Jesus admonish us in these?-'Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets . . . ' (Matt. vii. 12).

These were meant to inculcate friendship and love to all men; and no one, no wise and thoughtful man, will say that the admonition is wrong, that friendship and love to our fellowmen are not beneficial, that their results are nil, and that they do not blot out much that is wicked. As yet, truth compels me to state, Government has not cultivated the friendship of its people, as was its duty to do. The Creator has instilled it into the heart of man and the instinct of animals, that the strong should be kind to and care for the weak. The father loves his child before the child loves him. The man tries to win the woman, not the woman the man. If a man of low degree try to win the esteem of one in high position, he is liable to be styled a flatterer and not a friend. It was, therefore, for Government to try and win the friendship of its subjects, not for the subjects to try and win that of the Government. If it had done so, the results would have been great, and the people would have rejoiced.

Alas that it has not done so! If Government say that what I say is untrue-that they have tried to cultivate friendship and have only been repaid with enmity-I can only say, that if it had gone the right way to work, its subjects would most undoubtedly have been its friends and supporters, instead of, as in many instances, rising up in arms against it. Now friendship is a feeling which springs from the heart, and which cannot be kindled by "admonitions." Men may meet on very friendly terms, but it does not therefore follow that they are friends in the real sense of the word-that they are friends at heart as well as in outward signs. This is a link, as it were, between hearts: a man instinctively feels that he likes a man or the contrary. Government has hitherto kept itself as isolated from the people of India as if it had been the fire and they the dry grass-as if it thought that, were the two brought in contact, the latter would be burnt up. It and its people were

like two different sorts of stone, one white and the other black, which stones, too, were being daily more and more widely separated. Now the relations between them ought to have been close like those between the streaks of white and black in the stone called Abri, in which we see the former close alongside of the latter, the one blending with the other.

Government was, of course, perfectly right in maintaining special friendly relation with its Christian subjects (the English), but it was at the same time incumbent upon it to show towards its native subjects that brotherly kindness which the Apostle Paul exhorts us to in these words, "And to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity" (2 Peter i. 7). It must be borne in mind that the blood of the Mohammedan conquerors and that of the people of the country was not the same; that their faith was not the same; their manners and customs not the same; that in their hearts the people did not like them; and that at first there was little or no amalgamation of the two. What, then, was the secret of their becoming friends? Let us glance at the former Indian dynasties.

First came that of the Mohammedan conquerors. In the reign of the Turks and Pathans, there was no intercourse between the conquerors and the conquered until the Government of the former was made firm and easy. A feeling of cordiality was first established in the reign of the Mogul Emperor, Akbar I and continued till the reign of Shah Jehan. No doubt, owing to many defects in the system of Government, the people were subjected to many evils; but these were lightened by the feelings just mentioned. This feeling unfortunately ceased during the reign of Alumgeer,13 A.D. 1779, when, owing to the rebellion of several Hindus of note, such as Sewajee, the Mahratta, etc., Alumgeer vowed vengeance against them all, and sent orders to all his lieutenants to treat them with rigour and harshness, and to exempt none from paying tribute. The injury and disaffection which therefore ensued are well known. Now the English Government has been in existence upwards of a century, and up to the present hour has not secured the affections of the people.

One great source of the stability of a Government is undoubtedly the treating of its subjects with honour, and thus

gaining their affections. Though a man's income be but small, treat him with honour, and he is far more gratified than if he were presented with three or four times the amount and be treated with contempt. Contempt is an ineradicable wrong. Being treated contemptuously sinks deep into a man's heart, and although uninjured by the same as to his worldly goods, he still becomes an enemy.

The wound rankles deep, and cannot be healed; that given by a sword can be healed, but that inflicted by a contemptuous word cannot. The results of kindness are different: an enemy even, if treated courteously, becomes a friend; friends by friendly intercourse become greater friends, and strangers if treated in a friendly manner are no longer strangers. By kindness we make the brute creatures our willing slaves; how much more then would such treatment cement the bonds between a Government and its people? Now in the first years of the British rule in India the people were heartily in favour of it. This good feeling the Government has now forfeited, and the natives very generally say that they are treated with contempt. A native gentleman is, in the eyes of any petty official, as much lower than that official as that same official esteems himself lower than a duke. The opinion of many of these officials is that no native can be a gentleman.

Owing to the paucity of the European element, the people of India only stood in awe of the sepoy, who thus became puffed up with pride, and thought there were none like them in the world. They looked upon the European portion of the army as a myth, and thought that the many victories which the English had gained were gained entirely by their own prowess. A common saying of theirs was, that they had enabled the English to conquer Hindustan from Burmah to Cabul. This pride of the sepoys was most marked after the Punjab was conquered. So far had it gone, that they made objections to anything which they did not like, and, I believe even remonstrated when ordered to march consequent on the yearly reliefs. It was precisely at this time, when the army was imbued with this feeling of pride, and the knowledge or rather conjecture that Government would grant anything they stood out for, that the new cartridges were issued -cartridges which they really believed were made up with fat, and

the using of which would destroy their caste. They refused to bite them.

When the regiment at Barrackpore was disbanded, and the general order announcing the same was read out to each regiment, the deepest grief was felt throughout the army. They thought that the refusal to bite the cartridges, the biting of which would have destroyed their caste, was no crime at all; that the men of the disbanded regiment were not in the least to blame, and that their disbandment was an act utterly devoid of justice on the part of Government. The whole army deeply regretted ever having had anything to do with Government.

They felt that they had shed their blood in its cause, and conquered many countries for it; that in return it wished to take away their caste, and had dismissed those who had justly stood out for their rights. There was, however, no open rebellion just then, as they had only been disbanded and had not been treated with greater severity; but, partly from feeling certain that the cartridges were mixed with fat, partly from grief at seeing their comrades disbanded at Barrackpore, and still more by reason of their pride, arrogance, and vanity, the whole army was determined, come what might, not to bite the cartridges.

Correspondence was undoubtedly actively carried on in the army after the events at Barrackpore, and messages were sent telling the men not to bite the cartridges. Up to this time there was a strong feeling of indignation and irritation in the army, but, in my opinion, there was no intention of rebelling.

The fatal month of May 1857 was now at hand, in which the army was punished in a manner which thinking men know to have been most wrong and most inopportune. The anger which the news of this punishment created in the minds of the sepoys was intense. The prisoners, on seeing their hands and feet manacled, looked at their medals and wept. They remembered their services, and thought how they had been recompensed; and their pride, which, as I have before said, was the feeling of the whole army, caused them to feel the degradation all the more keenly. Then the rest of the troops at Meerut were fully persuaded that they would either be compelled to bite the cartridges or undergo the same punishment. This rage and grief led to the

fearful events of the 10th of May, which events are unparalleled in the annals of history. After committing themselves thus, the mutineers had no choice left but to continue in their career of rebellion.

HIS VISION

Sir Syed described his vision of the College/University he proposed to establish in an Urdu article written sometime in 1872, and re-printed in the Institute Gazette of April 5, 1911.

"I may appear to be dreaming and talking like Shaikh Chilli", he wrote,"but we aim to turn this M.A.O. College into a University similar to that of Oxford or Cambridge."

"Like the churches of Oxford and Cambridge, there will be mosques attached to each College. "

"There will be boarding houses, in which students will be provided with a suite complete with a bath, a study and a retiring room. The boarding house will have a Common Hall and a common dinning room. There will be playground and a swimming pool attached to it. There will be four bungalows constructed for the residence of the Principal, the Head Master and other Professors. The College will have a dispensary with a Doctor and a compounder, besides a Unani Hakim."

"IT will be mandatory on boys in residence to join the congregational payers (namaz) at all the five times. Students of other religions will be exempted from this religious observance. "

"Muslim students will have a uniform consisting of a black alpaca, halfsleeved chugha and a red Fez cap. All students shall be required to put on a pair of socks and shoes of western style.

"There will be fixed times for study, dinner, lunch, breakfast, bath, change and for every other activity."

"All articles of sports will be provided for. Bad and abusive words which boys generally pick up and get used to, will be strictly prohibited. Even such a word as a "liar" will be treated as a abuse to be prohibited."

"They will have food either on tables of European style or on chaukis in the manner of the Arabs. This will be decided by the students themselves, by a majority of votes. They will have special food once a week, to be decided by majority every week."

"Furniture, bedding etc. will be supplied by the College. The services of bearers, servants, watermen etc., will be provided and supervised by the boarding house authorities. Students will be required to possess sufficient quantity of clothes to keep them neat and clean. They will not be allowed to put on gaudy, or such fine clothes as might expose their body."

"Smoking of cigarette or huqqa, and the chewing of betels shall be strictly prohibited."

"No corporal punishment or any such punishment as is likely to injure a student's self-respect will be permissible. Stock punishment such as "standing" or extra home work or class work only will be meted out to erring students. Boys misbehaving in society will be sent down for a specified period."

"It will be strictly enforced that Shia and Sunni boys shall not discuss their religious differences in the College or in the boarding house."

"At present it is like a day dream. I pray to God that this dream may come true."

The 1857 revolt was one of the turning points of Syed Ahmad's life. Before it, his career had been that of a civil servant and a scholar. Most of the historical works, which were to win him an honorary fellowship of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, were completed before 1857. In 1847, he published the famous archaeological masterpiece, 'Asarus Sanadeed' - a book that provided a wealth of information on countless historical monuments in Delhi from the eight hundred year long Muslim era.

In 1855, he published yet another book 'Ain-e-Akbari'. After the 1857 revolt, Syed Ahmad authored the marvelous book 'Asbab-e-Baghawat-e-Hind' (The causes of Indian Revolt). The publication of this book in 1859 was, in fact, Syed Ahmad's induction to public life. He also witnessed the terrible revenge the British wrought on Delhi and its inhabitants after the city was recaptured in September 1857. At personal level, he found an uncle and a cousin dead; his aunt died of thirst before his eyes; he succeeded in

rescuing his mother only for her to die because of the privations she had experienced. Muslims were the main target of the Government's wrath.

In spite of all the suffering, Syed Ahmad was highly impressed by the culture and customs of Western society. He instituted Scientific Society in 1864 to create a scientific temperament among the Muslims and to make the Western knowledge available to Indians in their own language. He got translated many scientific works from English into Urdu.

The Aligarh Institute Gazette, an organ of the Scientific Society was started in March 1866 and succeeded in agitating the minds in the traditional Muslim Society. Anyone with a poor level of commitment would have backed off in the face of strong opposition but Sir Syed responded by bringing out another journal 'Tehzibul Akhlaq' which was rightly named in English as 'Mohammedan Social Reformer'. The Tehzibul Akhlaq succeeded in infusing a new desire amongst Muslims for acquiring modern knowledge. It also gave a new direction to Muslim social and political thought. It advocated the stance that Muslims should avoid getting involved in political issues until they achieved parity with the Hindu community in the field of education.

Along with his search for a solution to the community's backwardness, he continued writing for various causes. He wrote to defend Islam against the attacks of Christian missionaries, and to overcome religious prejudices.

Sir Syed finally reached to the conclusion that education was the main cause of the backwardness of the community. He thus rose to establish the Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh.

He wanted this College to act as a bridge between the old and the new, the East and the West. While he fully appreciated the need and urgency of imparting instruction based on Western learning, he was not oblivious of the value of oriental learning and wanted to preserve and transmit to posterity the rich legacy of the past. He, therefore, decided to keep a fine balance between the two. For a man born into a feudal family that had experienced the trauma of a declining Mughal empire, he was highly pragmatic

in his outlook and attitude. The College he founded was the visible embodiment of reason and progress.

The aim of Sir Syed was not merely restricted to establishing a college at Aligarh but at spreading a network of Muslim Managed educational institutions throughout the length and breadth of the country. To this end, he instituted All India Mohammedan Educational Conference. The Aligarh Movement motivated the Muslims to help open a number of educational institutions.

Sir Syed was the member of the Viceroy's Legislative Council from 1878-82. He presented evidence to Hunter Education Commission of 1882, and served on the Public Service Commission of 1887. He was knighted in 1888. In 1889 he received honorary LLD from Edinburgh University. He died on March 27, 1898 and was buried next to the mosque at AMU.

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, founder of Mohammadan Anglo-Oriental College which later became Aligarh State university was encouraged by British to communalise politics. He became a staunch ally of British and lent his commanding influence to preach gospel of loyalty among Muslims. He first opened his campaign againt Indian National Congress in 1887. (Indian national congress was founded in 1885 by Some British and Anglo-Indians to demand legislative assembly and other democratic rights) His speech in Lucknow in 18 December 1887 was full of venom. His primary aim was to win the Muslims reprieve for their part in mutiny of 1857. In 1893, Syed Ahmad Khan established the Mohammadan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association of Upper India which was opened only to Muslims and Englishmen. Thus started a long campaign to create a separate state for Muslims. Syed Ahmad Khan died in 1898 but with creation of Aligarh University and by planting seeds of venom he had done his damage. His path to holocaust was taken over by Agha Khan. Lord Minto on October 1 1906 in front of Agha Khan and other Muslim and British dignatories at Simla said, " I claim that in any system of representation whether it affects a muncipality, a District, or Legislative council, in which it is proposed to introduce or increase Mohammadan community should be represented as a community." (quote from Heritage of Sikhs, page 255, written by Harbans Singh).

This statment by Governor General was an open inticement to Muslim separatism. In 1909, Minto-Morley reforms gave weighted representatin to Muslims in provinces in which they were in minority. This created a permanent separatism between Muslims and Hindus. In 1916 Congress attempted to appease muslims by giving them several separate communal laws and claims in a pact called Lucknow Pact. In Punjab, 50 percent of seats were reserved for Muslims under this League-Congress pact and Sikhs were completely ignored. In 1916, A Sikh representative Sardar Gajjan Singh of Ludhiana moved an ammendment recommending the addition of words, "subject to the just claims of the sikhs". This was oppose by both Hindus and Muslims. At this time there were only two Sikhs in legislative assembly. The franchise committee was established by British to go into matter of composition of new legislatures based on religion. Sikhs were given 15 percent seats but were only 12 percent of Punjab, while Muslims in Bihar and Orissa were less than 10 percent and got 25 percent of total legislature seats.

Though Sikhs were smallest minority in Punjab, Sikhs were generally averse of communal representation. The muslims, in spite of being a majority, had been given statutory protection and weightage in form of separate electorates and reservation of seats. This created among the Sikhs a sense of grievance and they demanded to be treated on a par with the Muslims in the matter of political rights.

Chief Khalsa Diwan in 1928 observed that Sikhs are anxious to maintain their individuality while at the same time they are ready to co-operate with their sister communities for the development of a united nation. They would, therefor, be the first to welcome a declaration that no consideration of caste or religion shall affect the matter of organization of a national government in the country. Sikhs are prepared to stand on merit alone. British appointed a committee under Moti Lal Nehru to work out a scheme of government that is accepted to all. The committe prepared a report which was published in August 1928, Muslim opinion was totally against this report and Mohammad Ali Jinnah, an emerging leader of Muslims suggested number of amendments to it. Sikhs rejected the Nehru report for different reasons Baba

Kharak Singh in his speech put these points forth, first this report asked only for dominion status of Indians under British and not total freedom, second this report had laid the foundation of communalism by accepting separate electorates. On December 20, 1929, Baba Kharak Singh gave a speech at Lajpat Nagar, Lahare reiterated the Sikhs determination not to let any single community establish its political hegemony in Punjab. Sikhs he said had suffered more then anyone else, of the 31 Indian patriots sentenced to death, 27 were Sikhs, and out of 121 sentenced to long imprisonment, 91 were Sikhs. Nehru and Gandhi did meet Baba Kharak Singh and assured him of Sikh representation and keeping country united while Muslims remained silent.

But things slolwy were changing. Muslim league in the elections of 1936 won only two seats in Punjab and Unionist party led by Sikandar Hayat Khan formed the government, this party was mostly composed of feudal land lords. After these elections, Muslims league started showing its true colors. Several incidents inciting muslims against infidels were reported in muslims newspapers. Leaders like Jinnah and Liaqat Ali Khan who were behaved more like a englishman than a subcontinent muslim, started exploiting sentiments of Muslims through out India. Jinnah, although accomplished lawyer but was a petty, shrewd person who was only the second generation of nauveau-converted muslims. He can be truely called a pseudo British or a brown sahib. He was a muslim in name only. He drank liquor and ate pork, obviously to ape his British masters. Another thing to note is that he never really took part in any struggle for independence, other Muslim leaders like Maulana Abul Kalam, Frontier Gandhi and secular leaders like Gandhi, Nehru were put in jail for many years, while Jinnah was never jailed. Situation until 1940 had turned bad throughout India and relations between Hindus and muslims were turning cold.

In 1940, Mohammad Ali Jinnah called for a separate state for muslims called Pakistan to be created out of those areas which have Muslims living as majority. It was a shock for Sikhs, as Sikhs although were spread out through out punjab but were a minority in all provinces. British appointed Sir Stafford Cripps in 1942 to look after the creation of new provinces or a separate state for

Muslims. Sikh representation told this comission: "Why should a province that fails to secure three-fifths majority of its legislature, in which a religious community enjoys statutory majority, be allowed to hold a plebiscite and given the benefit of a bare majority. In fairness, this right should have beeb conceded to communities who are in permanent minority in the legislature. From the boundry of Delhi to the banks of Ravi River the population is divided as follows: Muslims, 4,505,000; Sikhs and other non-muslims, 7,060,000.

To this may be added the population of Sikh states of Patiala, Nabha, Jind, Kapurthala and Faridkot, which is about 2,600,000, of this Muslims constitute barely 20 percent and this reduces the ratio of Muslim population still further. We shall resist by all possible means, separation of Punjab from the all-India union. We shall never permit our motherland to be at the mercy of those who disown it. After it was a certainity that Pakistan will be formed, Giani Kartar Singh in 1943 declared a call for a Separate state called Azad Punjab, to be comprised of Ambala, Jullundar, Lahore, Multan, and Lyallpur divisions. Mastar Tara Singh president of SAD and other Sikh leaders such as Giani Sher Singh, Sadhu Singh Hamdard,Amar singh Dosanjh, Ajit singh Ambalvi supported this call for Azad Punjab. Then in a speech in Amritsar in August 1944, Master Tara Singh declared that Sikhs were a nation and as such a demand was formerly put forward by Shiromani Akali Dal in a resolution passed on March 22, 1946 for a separate Sikh state.

After this situation in Punjab was getting tense. On one hand Jinnah and Muslim league was calling for blood or Pakistan and declaring that Muslims are no believer of ahimsa and will resort to any means possible to achieve their means. Muslim league declared August 16th 1946 to be observed as Direct Action Day, where all muslims were asked to show the support for Pakistan by rioting. Explaining the implications of Direct Action Day threat, Liaqat Ali Khan, general secretary of Muslim league said "Direct action means resort to non-constitutional methods that can take any form which many suit the conditions under which we live. We cannot eliminate any methods. Direct Action means any action against the law." Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar spoke in more

forthright terms: "Pakistan can be achieved through shedding blood of others. Muslims are no believers in ahimsa.

The decree of violence and jingoism was enthusiastically embraced by the Muslim masses. The Muslim league created a private army called Muslim National Guards. Arms were being secretely amassed, petrol stored and lethel weapons laid in. Muslim league volunteers were especially trained in the skills of stabbing and fire-raising. Simultaneously, a chorus of hate and inflammatory exhortation flowed from the League pulpiteers and newspapers. Communal frenzy was worked up to a dangerous pitch and on appointed day the storm burst in Calcutta. H.S. Suhrawardy, Muslim league leader from Bengal let loose horron on the Hindu population on the morning of August 16 1946. Stabbing, looting, burning were the order of the day. For four days the League desperados had the city at their mercy. According to rough estimated about 15,000 persons were killed and injured while one hundred thousands were rendered homeless.

Then on 2nd September in Noakhali and Tippera (Bengal) where Hindus were in minority, violence broke out. Thousands of Hindus were cruelly murdered, their womenfolks abducted and compelled to marry Muslims, property looted. The Sikhs of Calcutta did a notable humanitarium job at the time of the Great killing, saving many innocent lives in Hindus as well as in Muslim localities. Soon violence spread northwards. According to Muslim league, the Sikhs were the only viable obstruction to Pakistan. Justice G.D. Khosla of the Fact Finding Organization setup by Government of India observed: "Sikhs had opposed the partition of India with even greater vigour than Hindus, because they felt that as a community they could only expect disaster in Pakistan, therefore it was against the Sikhs that spearpoint of the Muslim league attack was first aimed.

In the March 1947 riots, the Sikhs or Rawalpindi faced ahhihilation and large number of them left the district. Within a few weeks almost the entire Sikh population had migrated from the district. Rioting in Punjab started in first week of December in the district of Hazara. A Holy war was declared on Hindus and Sikhs. Sikh habitations were wiped out, Gurdwaras were desecrated. Rioting in Lahore was started in March 4 1947, it

started out as stabbing and small incidents and spread out to become arson and murder. Soon after Muslims in Amritsar (muslims were about 40-50% of population before partition) went rioting, a mob tried to attack Golden Temple and were repulsed with a pitched battle fought between handful of Sikhs under Jathedar Udham Singh Nagoke.

Same day muslims of Sharifpura (a suburb of Amristar), stopped a train full of refugees from Pakistan for slaughter. After this incident, Sikhs and Hindus in Amritsar were furious and many innocent muslims had to bear the fury of anger. Soon after Amritsar was empty of Muslims. While total number of casualties were about same on both sides, about 100-150 million refugees were exchanged between both countries. There were large number of atrocities inflicted on women, many were abducted and raped. In village Thoh Khalsa (now in Pakistan), 1000 Sikh and Hindu women jumped into well to save their honor after their menfolks were killed by Muslim mobs. It is estimated that about 1 million Hindus/Sikhs/Muslims were murdered and 10-50 millions were injured. Property lost was in trillion of dollars.

Muslims did got their Pakistan but soon after it was put under marshall law by its feudal infested army. Sikhs did themselves a big favour by opting out of Pakistan at this time in Pakistan situation of few Hindus/Christians/other muslims (shia, Ahmadias) is worse off then in any other country. Judges are often asked to hang a non-muslims only on the basis of accusation. Sikh leadership opted for India and millions of Sikhs migrated to East Punjab and Delhi. Recently a well known bishop of a church shot himself on the door steps of a court in Pakistan after another christian was sentenced to death after a false accusation.

WRITINGS AND SPEECHES OF SIR SYED AHMAD KHAN

In 1871-72 Sir W. W. Hunter wrote a book The Indian Musalmans in which he arraigned the Muslims of India as being disloyal to the British rule. Sir Syed wrdte a review on it which appeared in a series of articles in the Pioneer. These articles wfere collected in England by Hafiz Ahmad Hasan, Vakil of Tonk. He got them published and succeeded in removing the misunderstanding created by Sir W. W. Hunter. (Abridged)

The attention of the public has been lately turned to the state of Mahommedan feeling in India, owing to three causes - viz., the Wahabi trial, Dr Hunter's book on the 'Indian Mussulmans/ and the murder of the late lamented Chief Justice Norman. Dr Hunter's work has made a great sensation in India, and has been read with avidity by all classes of the community. I commenced its perusal hoping that a light would be shed upon what, to the general public, has been hitherto an obscure subject; arid as I had heard that the author was a warm friend of Mohammedans, my interest in the work was great.

No man, and especially no Mohammedan, can have peruse'd this, the accomplished author's last celebrated work, without being it pressed with his extreme literary skill, his Macaulay-like talent of vivifying everything that his pen treats of. Literary skill is not, however, everything, and an author writing for the Indian as well as for the English public, should be careful not to so colour the subject which he treats of as to make it mischievous and of small value as an historical work. I am aware that many of the ruling race in India are under the impression that English literature, both books and newspapers, seldom, if ever, permeates the strata of native society. As regards general literature, this impression is correct as far as the millions are concerned; but on particular subjects, such as the state of feeling of the English to the natives, religious questions, or matters affecting taxation, it is a mistaken one.

Natives anxiously con all articles bearing upon the feelings with which their rulers regard them. Articles sneering at them, or misrepresenting their thoughts and feelings, sink deep into their soul, and work much harm. Although all cannot read, they manage to hear the contents of this and that article or work from those who can, and the subject usually receives a good deal of embellishment as it is passed from one to the other. Articles or books on religious and fiscal questions are also eagerly commented on by a large proportion of the population.

What books and newspapers enunciate is, by the general native public, believed to be the opinion of the whole English community, official or non-official-from the veriest clerk to the Governor-General in Council-nay even to the Queen herself! Such

being the case, writers should be careful of their facts when treating of any important subject, and having got their facts, ought to avoid all exaggeration or misrepresentation. Now, when we find an official, high in office and in favour with Government, giving utterance to assertions and assumptions such as those contained in Dr Hunter's work, it is but natural that we Mohammedans should come to the conclusion that the author's opinions are shared in more or less by the whole English community.

I have before mentioned that I had expected great things from Dr Hunter's book. Alas that I should add one more to the long list of disappointed men! Friend to the Mohammedans as Dr Hunter no doubt is, his friendship, as represented by this, his last work, has worked us great harm. 'God save me from my friends!' was the exclamation which rose to my lips as I perused the author's pages. I perfectly admit the kindly feeling towards Mohammedans which pervades the whole book, and for this I heartily thank the talented author. At the same timer I regret deeply that his good intentions should have been so grievously frustrated by the manner in which he has written, and that he has used his 'power of the pen' in a way calculated still more to embitter the minds of Englishmen against the already little-loved Moslems.

Dr Hunter expressly states that it is only the Bengal Mohammedans to whom he applies the subject-matter of the book, and that it is only them whom he knows intimately. The book, however, abounds in passages which lead the reader to believe that it is not merely the Bengal Mohammedans that the author treats of, but the Mohammedans throughout India. The title of the work itself proves this-'Our Indian Musalmans: Are they bound in conscience to rebel against the Queen?' Again, at page 11 there occurs the following passage: 'Discussions which disclose the Mohammedan masses eagerly drinking in the poisoned teaching of the apostles of insurrection, and a small minority anxiously seeking to get rid of the duty to rebel by ingenious interpretations of their sacred law/ Again, on the same page - 'The Musalmans of India are, and have been for many years, a source of chronic danger to the British power in India/ With a knowledge, therefore, only of Bengal Mohammedans, the author gives us the general feeling of Mohammedans throughout India. As a

cosmopolitan Mohammedan of India, I must raise my voice in opposition to Dr Hunter in defence of my fellowcountrymen. I know full well the arduousness of the task which I have undertaken-the difficulty which encompasses every adequate of a cause which has been pre- and mis-judged by men of a, different race. I only ask for an impartial hearing in the words of the Bishop of Manchester, spoken at Nottingham last month: 'All things are possible to him that believeth, and where there is true faith there is certain to be no obliquity of conduct/ Being firm in my belief in what I am about to write, I hope that it may be possible for me to convince the public that all is not gold that glitters, and that all is not exactly as Dr Hunter would have it believed.

As Dr Hunter's work represents Wahabiism and rebellion against the British Government as synonymous, I will first proceed to review the light in which the former is presented to the Indian public by the learned Doctor, and I will then pass on to the consideration of the latter question. Wahabiism has withal been little understood by the world at large, and it is rather difficult to put it in a comprehensive light before the public. In my opinion, what the Protestant is to Roman Catholic, so is the Wahabi to the other Mohammedan creeds. A work on Wahabiism was translated into English, and published in the 13th volume of the 'Royal Asiatic Journal' in 1852. In it the doctrines of the faith are pretty accurately defined, and Dr Hunter has reduced them to the following seven doctrines: 'First/absolute reliance upon one God; second, absolute renunciation of any mediatory agent between man and his Maker, including the rejection of the prayers of the Saints, and even of the semi-divine mediation of Mohammed himself; third, the right of private interpretation of the Mohammedan Scriptures, and the rejection of all priestly glosses of the Holy Writ; fourth, absolute rejection of all the forms, ceremonies, and outward observances with which the medieval and modern Mohammedans have overlaid the pure faith; fifth, constant looking for the Prophet (Imam), who will lead the true believers to victory over the infidels; sixth, constant recognition, both in theory and practice, of the obligation to wage war upon all infidels; seventh, implicit obedience to the spiritual guide/ Now there are several errors here.

The latter part of the second doctrine is so ambiguously worded that the meaning does not stand out very clear: it ought to stand thus-'And to recognize Mohammed as nothing more than an inspired man, and to disbelieve in any power of mediation by saints or prophets, including Mohammed himself, before the holy tribunal/ The third doctrine is also ambiguous, and I would amend it thus-'Right of every individual to interpret the Koran according to his lights, and not to be bound to follow implicitly the interpretation put Upon the same by any former priest/ The fifth doctrine is quite obscure, and its true meaning is much altered. It bears a great affinity to the belief of the Jews and Christians - in the advent of the Messiah of the former, and of the second coming of Christ of the latter. Mohammedans believe that before the end of the world, and before the second advent of Christ, an Imam will descend on the earth to lead true believers to victory over the infidels.

Many Mohammedans disbelieve in this, and regard it as a story invented by the Jews, and which has crept into their religion. However this may be, it will be observed that Dr Hunter has perverted its meaning, and has represented the present generation of Wahabis as expecting the Imam to lead them to victory against the English. The sixth doctrine has also suffered at the author's hands. Had he added the words-'provided that the Musalmans leading the jihad be not the subjects of those infidels, living under them in peace, and without any oppression being exercised towards them-provided that they have not left their property and families under the protection of such infidels -provided that there exists no treaty between them and the infidels-and provided that the Musalmans be powerful enough to be certain of success,'-had, I say, all these provisions been added by our author, his rendering of this doctrine would have been correct.

His object, however, being to present the Wajiabi doctrines in their most terrifying form, he wisely omitted all these provisions. I do not understand what the author means by the words 'spiritual guide' in the seventh doctrine. If by it he implies a guide of faith, he is in error, as by the third doctrine Wahabis are not bound to follow any priest blindly. If, however, he means a Mohammedan ruler, he is right. One thing, however, he has omitted to tell us-

viz., that Mohammedans are bound to obey an infidel ruler as long as he does not interfere with their religion. I would particularly urge on my readers to bear these doctrines in mind as now interpreted by me-Dr Hunter's rendering of them being ambiguous and calculated to mislead.... I shall now endeavour to explain the faith and persuasion of the frontier tribes amongst whom Dr Hunter establishes the rebel camp.

The mountain tribes on our north-west frontier are Sunis. They belong to the Hanafi sect, and are stricter in the observance of their religion than their co-religionists of the plains. The latter bear no enmity towards the other three Mohammedan sects; whilst the hostility of the mountain tribes to all other sects is bitter in the extreme. An outsider has no security for his life or property whilst in their country, unless he changes his tenets, and adapts them to those of the Hanafis amongst whom his lot is cast,... These wild denizens of the hills generally take, as their text-books, commentaries on the Hanafi Church, of which Dur-i-Mukhtar is one. This was written in the year 1071 Hegira, or A.D. 1660, and is the religious work most venerated by them. It contains some Arabic verses upholding the Hanafi doctrines in preference to all others.

A translation of one of these, showing the hatred borne by the Hanafis to the followers of the other Churches, is as follows: 'May the curses of our God, innumerable as the sands of the sea, fall upon him who followeth not the doctrines of Abu-Hanifa.' These hill tribes lay great stress upon the worship of tombs of saints and monasteries, especially those of Peer Baba in Bonair, and Raka Sahib in Kotah. I have never yet met any Pathan of any other faith than the Hanafi, or any inclined to Wahabiism. In the Hay at Afgani, however,-an Urdu history published at Lahore in 1867, and written by a loyal Mohammedan in the service of Government-I find the following

passage: 'But of late the followers of Mulla Syed Meer of Kotah are looked upon as Wahabis, and are held in contempt by the people of Swat, subjects of the Akhoond of Swat and staunch Hanafis. Most of the Atmanzais and the descendants of Nasir-ullab of Garhi Ismail are the partisans of Mulla Syed Meer, whilst all the other mountain tribes follow the Akhoond of Swat/ From

the foregoing it is evident how utterly antagonistic Wahabiism is to the faith of the frontier tribes, and, as far as religion is concerned, how impracticable it is to form a coalition between the Pathans and the Wahabis. The latter, who in 1824 settled themselves in the hills, determined to wage war to the death against the hated Sikhs, could never persuade the hill tribes to look with favour on their religious tenets. Hating each other as they did, however, they, smarting under the oppressions and severities of the Sikhs, made common cause against them. It was these very Pathans, however, who betrayed the Wahabis to the Sikhs, and it was owing to them that Syed Ahmad and Moulvi Ismail Saheb3 were afterwards slain. These facts must be borne in mind, as they are absolutely necessary to a proper understanding of the Wahabi history, represented by Dr Hunter as a great coalition of the mountain tribes.

In the first chapter of his work Dr Hunter has given us an account of the establishment of the Wahabi rebel camp. I demur, however, to many of his statements; and will now proceed to give a short account of the Indian Wahabis, without which it is impossible to show in what points our author has been misled, and how greatly he has exaggerated the facts of the case. The history of the Indian Wahabis is divided into five periods. The first extends from 1823 to 1830 i.e., from the year Syed Ahmad and Moulvi Ismail preached and inaugurated the holy war against the Sikhs, the oppressors of their Mohammedan subjects, to the time when Peshawur was recaptured from the hands of their followers* The second extends from 1830 to 1831 i.e., from the reconquest of Peshawur to the death of Syed Ahmad and Moulvi Ismail. The third embraces the period from the death of these leaders to the time when, after the annexation of the Panjab by the British, the Wahabis, and amongst them Inayat Ali and Wilayat Ali,4 were sent from the frontier to their homes in Hindustan viz., from 1831 to 1847.

The fourth extends from 1847 to the second expedition of Inayat Ali and Wilayat Ali to the frontier, and to their death. The fifth is the present period, which Dr Hunter erroneously calls the period of Wahabi insurrection. The first period of the Wahabi history was its golden age. Everything that the Wahabis of that

age did was known to Government, and they were not at that time in any way suspected of disloyalty to the British. Mohammedans at that time openly preached a holy war against the Sikhs, in order to relieve their fellow-countrymen from the tyranny of that race. The leader of the jihadis was Syed Ahmad, but he was no preacher. Moulvi Ismail was the man whose preaching work marvels on the feelings of Mohammedans. Throughout the whole of his career, not a word was uttered by this preacher calculated to incite the feelings of his co-religionists against the English. Once at Calcutta, whilst preaching the jihad against the Sikhs, he was interrogated as to his reasons for not proclaiming a religious war against the British, who were also infidels.

In reply he said, that under the English rule Mohammedans were not persecuted, and as they were the subjects of that Government, they were bound by their religion not to join in a jihad against it. At this time thousands pf armed men and large stores of munitions of war were collected in India for the jihad against the Sikhs. Commissioners and magistrates were aware of this, and they reported the facts to Government. They were directed not to interfere, as the Government was of opinion that their object was not inimical to the British. In 1824 these jihadis against the Sikhs reached the frontier, and they were afterwards continually strengthened by recruits and money from India. This was well known to Government, and in proof of this I will cite the following case: A Hindu banker of Delhi, entrusted with money for the Wahabi cause on the frontier, embezzled the same, and a suit was brought against him before Mr William Fraser, later Commissioner of Delhi. The suit was decided in favour of the plaintiff, Moulyi Ishak, and the money paid in by the defendant was forwarded to the frontier by other means. The case was afterwards appealed to the Sudder Court at Allahabad, but the decision of the Lower Court was upheld.

At this time the Wahabi cause prospered. With the aid of the frontier tribes, Peshawur was conquered, and was made over to Sultan Mohammad Khan, brother of the late Dost Mohammad Khan of Cabul. It was, however, soon after treacherously sold by him to Ranjeet Sinha. During the second period the Wahabi cause waned. When Peshawur again fell into the hands of the Sikhs,

numbers of the learned men amongst the followers of Syed Ahmad and Moulvi Ismail lost heart completely. They saw that the Pathan tribes on the frontier hated them on account of their faith-that no help was therefore to be expected from them; and they saw that their own number was too small to cope successfully with the Sikhs. They therefore declared that they were no longer bound by their religion to continue the contest. A difference of opinion had also arisen amongst them as to the fitness of Syed Ahmad to be their leader, most of them declaring that he was unfit, whilst others maintained the contrary. Moulyi Ismail exerted himself to the utmost to allay these dissensions. He wrote a work entitled Mansab-i-Imamat, which was published in Calcutta in the year 1265 Hegira (A.D. 1849).

All his efforts were, however, unavailing, and the band was broken up. Thousands returned to their homes in India, of whom the most noted were Mpulvi Mahbub Ali, who died in 1864, and Moulvi Haji Mohammad. The latter was a resident of Lower Bengal, but he married at Delhi, and resided there for many years. He died at Alwar in 1870. It may interest my readers to learn that the above-named Mahbub Ali was the same man who in 1857 was summoned by the rebel leader, Bukht Khan, and requested by him to sign the proclamation for the religious war against the English. He refused, and told Bukht Khan that the Mohammedan subjects of the British Government could not, according to the precepts of their religion, rise up in arms against their rulers. He, moreover, reproached him and his followers for the inhuman cruelties perpetrated by them towards the European ladies and children.

After this secession, Syed Ahmed's following was much reduced; and in 1831 he, with most of his adherent, was, through the treachery of Khadi Khan, slain in action against Shere Sinha. On their leader's death, the desertions from the cause were numerous. In order to prevent these, it was falsely given out that Syed Ahmad was alive, and had miraculously disappeared and hidden himself in a cave. This deception was, however, soon exposed, and the followers of Syed Ahmad returned to their homes. After this period the supplies of men and money, etc., in aid of the jihad, ceased entirely from the North-West Provinces.

What occurred during the third period is not very interesting. I would here mention that Syed Ahmad, after the recapture of Peshawur by the Sikhs, asked those of his followers who were resolved to die with him for the cause, to make a solemn promise (bayat-fil jihad) to this effect.

Several hundred complied; and it is almost certain that only the few of those who survived the battle fought against Shere Sinha, remained in the hills after the fall of their leader, Syed Ahmad. The majority of them were from Patna, and other parts of Bengal. Moulvis Inayat Ali and Wilayat Ali of Patna, now became their leaders, but did nothing towards the furtherance of jihad. On the annexation of Panjab by the British, they and most of their followers were despatched to their homes in 1847* Now we have seen how recruits and money were forwarded from Patna and other parts of Bengal, and India generally, during the three first periods of frontier Wahabi history; but I think it is very evident that not a man of these was intended or used for an attack on British India, nor was there the slightest grounds for supposing, during these three periods, that there was a rebellious spirit growing up amongst the general Mohammedan public in India*

And yet Dr Hunter maintains (page 79) that "about thirty years ago one of the Caliphs came on a missionary tour to Bengal, settled there, became trusted by all the neighbouring landed proprietors, and preached rebellion with great force and unction*"

He also, says our author, "forwarded yearly supplies of men and money to the propaganda at Patna, for transmission to the frontier camp." Now this brings us back to the year 1841 or so, when several years had still to elapse before the Panjab was annexed by the British. Does Dr Hunter really believe that men and money were forwarded at that time to enable the frontier people to attack the English? I think he will admit that a holy war against the Sikhs had been going on for many years before the year 1841, and that it is but probable that the 'men and money supplies' were intended for the defeat of the subjects of the Panjab rulers. I will now proceed to show that in the fourth period also there is no foundation for any suspicion whatever against my co-religionists in India. The English, who are unacquainted with the general run of Mohammedan opinion, will probably deem me an

interested partisan, and will pay small attention to, or place little reliance upon, what I think and write. This, however, must not deter me from speaking what I know to be the truth. After the return to India of Moulvis Inayat Ali and Wilayat Ali in 1847, there still remained a small remnant of Syed Ahmad's followers on the frontier. It is true that these two never slackened their efforts to induce men of Patna and the vicinity to join in the jihad, and to collect money for the purpose. They were indefatigable and in 1851 they showed what was still their leading idea by again leaving India for the frontier/Now

Dr Hunter has made out that it was with the intention of waging war with the British that they again resorted to the frontier, and that they thus transferred the jihad from the Sikhs to the British. Was this likely when they had no cause of complaint against the latter? We have already seen, in the oppression of Mohammedans by the Sikhs, what reason the former had for attacking the latter; but no reason has yet been shown, eijther by Dr Hunter or by any one else, for this sudden hatred to the British. No; it was against the Sikhs in Jammu that their arms were directed. I have this from one who met these two Moulvis on their way to the frontier, and I have no doubt of its truth. It must be borne in mind how very strict in their religion these Wahabis are Stern fanatics, they never swerve aside from the principles of that faith. Now those of whom I am writing had left their families and property in the care of the British Government, and their faith expressly forbids them taking up arms against the protectory of their families.

Had they fought and died in battle against the English, they would have been deprived of the joys of Paradise and martyrdom, and would have been deemed sinners against their own religion. We have seen how small were the remnants of the Wahabi band on the frontier, and it has been shown how hated they were by the hill tribes on account of their religious tenets. One feels inclined to smile when we read sentences like this in Dr Hunter's book: "The second minute of Lord Dalhousie had to deal with a proposition for a frontier war against the border tribes, whose superstitious hatred to the infidel the Hindustani fanatics had again fanned to a red heat" (page 23),

Our author forgets the very important fact that these mountain tribes have been turbulent from time immemorial; that they have never allowed any peace to any nation living on their frontiers, whether so-called infidels or Musalmans; that they fought indiscriminately with the Mohammedan emperors of Delhi and with the Sikhs in the Pan jab. Like the Irishman at a fair, it mattered little to them who it was, as long as it was some one to fight with. Even the great tyrant Nadir Shah9, whose name was feared throughout India, was never able to keep them in subjection. With regard to Wilayat Ali and Inayat Ali, and their small following, nothing has ever transpired to show that they ever conspired against the British power in India. On their death, which happened a few years after 1851, their followers all dispersed.

It is quite true that inen and money were transmitted, during the stay of these Moulvis on the frontier, from Patna and other parts of Bengal; but no one believed that they were to be used against the British. It is not likely that a force so feeble could aspire to overturn the strong British empire. The fifth period of Indian Wahabiism has also, in my humble opinion, no connection whatever with jihad. I cannot believe that after the death of Wilayat Ali and Inayat Ali, men or money were forwarded to the frontier from Bengal in furtherance of a religious war. Since 1857, however, a band of desperate men, composed of mutineers and others-who, through the severe punishments meted out during the Mutiny, fled for their lives to those remote tracts-have taken up their abode at Mulka, Sittana, in the Nepal Terai, and in the deserts of Bikaneer and Rajputana. Those who fled to the North-West frontier were Hindus of all castes, as well as Mohammedans of different denominations; and they instinctively collected together fleeing, as they were, from a common danger. It was they, as mentioned above, who occupied Mulka and other places; and to assert, as Dr Hunter does, that they were there for the purpose of making a religious war against Government-composed, as their band was, of Hindus and Musalmans of all castes and denominations - is too absurd for belief.

It is not unlikely, however, that many of these refugees were in communication with their homes in different parts of India,

and it is very probable that they were assisted with sums of money by their relatives. A man, because he becomes an outlaw, does not necessarily forfeit the love of his relatives, nor do they feel it the less incumbent upon them to assist him by any means in their power. This has probably formed one of the bases upon which Dr Hunter has constructed his edifice of a 'regularly organised system of contributions of men and money in aid of a religious war against Government/ Another was probably the fact of money having found its way from India to the Akhoond of Swat. Now my readers are probably all aware that every Mohammedan is bound, according to the precepts of his faith, to set apart at the end of each year, for the purpose of charity, one-fortieth part of his capital.

This is termed zakat. Many of course, do not act up to their religion, and decline to put their hands into their pockets to benefit others; but all good Wahabis, and also all Mohammedans who have Wahabi proclivities, discharge this duty faithfully. The money thus set apart is paid by them to the poor of the neighbourhood, to travellers passing through their towns and villages, to Moulvis famed for their learning, to convents where pious men live in retirement, and to pupils in mosques, for their education. In distributing these alms, they can scarcely be required to find out all the recipient's antecedents; and so frightened have Mohammedans now become of being accused of aiding and abetting sedition, that in many cases men have abstained altogether from assisting travellers or any one else.

Apparently no Mohammedan can now dispense his zakat without laying himself open to the charge of aiding a jihad against the English. As regards the Akhoond of Swat I have no doubt that he may have received portions of zakat from wealthy Mohammedans. He is, however no Wahabi, and I can confidently assert that any sums which he may have received had no connection whatever with a jihad against the Indian Government. The school kept by Shah Abdul Azeez and the convent of Gulam Ali at Delhi received pecuniary aid from all parts of the world besides India; and one might just as well assert that they were aided for the purpose of waging jihad, as maintain that the Akhoond of Swat was subsidised for this purpose from India.

Having thus given a resume of the history of Indian Wahabiism, I would request my readers to bear the same in mind whilst accompanying me through the pages of Dr Hunter's work.

I think I have proved that the Indian Wahabi jihad-represented by our author to have been one against the British-was intended solely for the conquest of the Sikhs; and that, even although the band of mutineers at Mulka and Sittana may have given trouble to Government after 1857, the frontier colony, composed as it was of Hindus as well as Mohammedans, was scarcely one which could be designated as a jihadi community. On opening Dr Hunter's book, in the very first page occurs the following sentence: For years a rebel colony has threatened our frontier, from time to time sending forth fanatic swarms, who have attacked our camps, burned our villages, murdered our subjects, and involved our troops in three costly wars/ This is very pretty writing, enriched as the sentence is by the phrases 'rebel colony* and 'fanatic swarms;' but the unprejudiced reader will at once ask, 'To whom does the author refer?'

If he refers to the Wahabis who settled there to wage jihad against the Sikhs, I have shown how unfounded such an assertion would be; and if he means the band of mutineers-Hindus and Mohammedans-who fled from Hindustan during the Mutiny, what earthly connection have their raids with Dr Hunter's question, 'Our Indian Musalmans: Are they bound in conscience to rebel against the Queen?'....

It is unfortunate for Dr Hunter that he has, throughout his work, relied upon very weak authorities when treating of Mohammedan creeds. The learned Doctor has shown little discretion in not sifting more carefully the chaff from the wheat. We come now to a sentence which now Englishman desirous of bridging over the gulf which separates our rulers from us ought ever to have penned. He says: 'Every Mohammedan religionist, too zealous to live quietly under a Christian Government, girded up his loins and made for the Sittana camp/ What an aspersion is this upon the whole Mohammedan community which remained quietly in India! He does not seem to know what the Mohammedan, and still more the Wahabi, precepts enjoin on this subject; of knowing the same, he wilfully perverts their meaning.

Wahabis act strictly up to the commands of the Prophet; and it is a well-known fact that, during the Mohammedan persecution at Mecca, Mohammed himself ordered his staunchest followers to take refuge in the Christian kingdom of Abyssinia* To say, therefore, that zealous Mohammedans could not remain quietly in British territory, and that they felt themselves bound to repair to the frontier, is as untrue as it is uncalled for. Does Dr Hunter mean to maintain that none of us Mohammedans who remained in India are good and zealous Musalmans? Dr Hunter gives in extenso the history of Syed Ahmad and Abdool Wahab, and at page 61 says: "Whatever was dreamy in his nature now gave place to a fiery ecstasy, in which he beheld himself planting the Crescent throughout every district of India, and the Cross buried beneath the carcasses of the English infidels."

Syed Ahmad, or properly speaking, Moulvi Ismail, certainly devoted all his energies to the reform of his faith in India-encrusted as it had become, with formulas foreign to the original true faith. In this sense, therefore, Dr Hunter is correct in his assertion as to his desire to have the Crescent planted in every district throughout India. The latter part of the sentence, however, is given by Dr Hunter without quoting his authority, and is more than I can believe to be true. The summons issued by Syed Ahmad to the Mohammedans, in favour of a jihad against the Sikhs, completely refutes it. No Wahabi could have enunciated any such opinion, contrary, as it would have been, to the tenets of their faith; and I cannot but believe that here again has Dr Hunter been misled by some person or persons inimical to Wahabiism. In treating of the Wahabi literature, Dr Hunter states, that 'throughout the whole literature of the sect, this obligation (jihad) shines forth as the first duty of regenerate man/ And again on page 66: "But any attempt at even the briefest epitome of the Wahabi treatises, in prose and verse, on the duty to wage war against the English, would fill a volume".

He also gives the prophesies on the downfall of the British banner, with a list of fourteen books, and quotes several passages from the same. Dr Hunter then proceeds to a consideration of the Shia sect; and although he afterwards qualifies (page 119) the panegyric which he passes upon them, I am glad to see that the learned Doctor approves of a portion at least of one of the sects of the Indian Mohammedan community. Let us be thankful for small mercies. He then goes on to prove, with great acumen and ability, that India has now lapsed into Dar-ul-Harb,10 refuting at the same time with equal skill the decision arrived at by the Calcutta Mohammedan Literary Society, viz., that Hindustan is still a Dar-ul-Islam, If the Calcutta Mahommedan Literary Society means that India is Dar-ul-Islam in the primary signification of the word, I concur with Dr Hunter in the arguments he has given to disprove the decision of that learned Society; but if the Society call India Dar-ul-Islam in the secondary meaning of the word, I am at one with them in their decision.

It is a great mistake to suppose that the country can only be either a Dar-ul-Islam or a Dar-ul-Harb in the primary signification of the words, and that there is no intermediate position. A true Dar-ul-Islam is a country which under no circumstances can be termed a Dar-ul-Harb, and vice versa. There are, however, certain countries which, with reference to certain circumstances, can be termed Dar-ul-Islam, and with reference to others Dar-ul-Harb. Such a country is India at the present moment. At page 128 he says: 'The Wahabis start with the declaration that India has become a country of the enemy, and from this they deduce the obligation of holy war against its rulers;* and again, at page 140, he repeats the same assertion in the following words: 'The Wahabis, whose zeal is greater than their knowledge, deduce from the fact of India being technically a country of the enemy, the obligation to wage war upon its rulers/ This is a perfectly groundless charge against the sect who, from the very fact of India having become Dar-ul-Harb, deemed jihad against Government unlawful. They therefore never waged war against it, not even during the great Mutiny of 1857.

If Dr Hunter still maintains that he is right in the foregoing assertions, I would ask him to give us any authority showing that the Wahabis have ever declared jihad against the British in India to be lawful. The Mohammedan doctors of Mecca are the next to whom our author applies the rod. At page 123 he writes: 'Still more significantly, the two most important decisions, that of the Mecca doctors and of Moulvi Abdul Hai, confine themselves to

affirming that India is a country of Islam, and most carefully avoid drawing the inference: that rebellion is therefore unlawful;' and again, at page 130, he says: T therefore view with extreme suspicion the decision of the doctors at Mecca-that stronghold of fanaticism and intolerant zeal-when they declare that India is a country of Islam; but who,, instead of deducing therefrom, as the Calcutta Mohammedan Literary Society infer, that rebellion is therefore unlawful, leave it to their Indian co-religionists to draw the opposite conclusion-namely, that rebellion is therefore incumbent.' I cannot see how this accusation can hold; as, if we refer to the question asked them, as given in'Dr Hunter's appendix, we find that they were never consulted as to the lawfulness or otherwise of jihad in India. Why should they give a reply to what they never asked? The inference drawn by Dr Hunter is very unfair....

Towards the end of the third chapter, Dr Hunter says that he has no hope of enthusiastic loyalty and friendship from the Mohammedans of India; the utmost he can expect from them is a cold acquiescence in British rule. If our author is so hopeless on account of our faith being that of Islam, let me commend to his attention the 85th verse, chapter V of the Holy Koran (George Sale's Translation): 'Thou shalt surely find the most violent of all men in enmity against the true believers to be the Jews and the idolaters; and thou shalt surely find those among them to be the most inclinable to entertain friendship for true believers who say we are Christians. This cometh to pass because there are priests and monks among them, and because they are not elated with pride/ Like begets like; and if cold acquiescence is all that Mohammedans receive at the hands of the ruling race, Dr Hunter must not be surprised at the cold acquiescence of the Mohammedan community/Let us both- Christians and Mohammedans- remember and act up to the words of Jesus Christ: 'Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets/ (Matt. vii. 12).

It is evident that as long as Musalmans can preach the unity of God in perfect peace, no Musalinan can, according to his religion, wage war against the rulers of that country, of whatever creed they be. Next to the Holy Koran, the most authoritative and

favourite works of the Wahabis are 'Bokhari* and 'Muslim', and both of them say: "Wheii our Prophet, Mohammed, marched against any infidel people to wage holy war upon them, he stopped the commencement of hostilities till morning, in order to find out whether the azan (call for prayer) was being called in the adjacent country. If so, he never fought with its inhabitants/' His motive for this was, that from hearing the azan12 he (the Prophet) could at once ascertain whether the Moslems of the place could discharge their religious duties and ceremonies openly and without molestation.

Now we Mohammedans of India live in this country with every sort of religious liberty; we discharge the duties of our faith with perfect freedom; we read our azans as loud as we wish; we can preach our faith on the public roads and thoroughfares as freely as Christian missionaries preach theirs; we fearlessly write and publish our answers to the charges laid against Islam by the Christian clergy, and even publish works against the Christian faith; and last, though not least, we make converts of Christians to Islam without fear or prohibition. My reply to Dr Hunter's question is, therefore, that in no case would it be the religious duty of any Mohammedan to renounce the aman13 of the English, and render help to the invader.

Should they do so, they would be regarded as sinners against their faith, as they would then break that holy covenant which binds subjects to their rulers, and which it is the duty of the former to keep sacred to the last. I cannot, however, predict what the actual conduct of the Musalmans would be in the event of an invasion of India by a Mohammedan or any other Power. He would be a bold man, indeed, who would answer for more than his intimate friends and relations, perhaps not even for them. The civil wars in England saw fathers fighting against sons, and brothers against brothers; and no one can tell what the conduct of a whole community would be in any great political convulsion. I have no doubt but that the Musalmans would do what their political status-favourable or the contrary-would prompt them to do. I think Dr Hunter's crucial question might be put to the Hindu as well as to the Mohammedan community. It would be but fair to both parties....

In conclusion, although cordially thanking Dr Hunter for the good feeling which he at times evinces towards my fellowcountrymen, I cannot but regret the style in which he "has written. I cannot divest myself of the idea that when he commenced his work he was more imbued with the desire to further the interests of Mohammedans- in India than is afterwards apparent in his pages. This Wahabi conspiracy has, I think, influenced his mind as he wrote, and he has allowed himself to be carried away by it. His work was politically a grave, and in a minor degree an historical mistake. It is, however, hard, as I have already said, for one of the minority to attempt to remove the impression which literary skill like Dr Hunter's has undoubtedly made on the minds of the Indian public.

This impression was, as regards the native community, heightened by Dr Hunter's work having received the approbation of the highest functionary in India. I could not, however, in justice to myself and my co-religionists, have kept silence when such erroneous statements were thrown broadest over the land. I have striven as much as in me lay to refute the errors published by Dr Hunter, and although my efforts may have been in vain, I feel that I have done my duty.

12

Rafi Ahmed Kidwai

Rafi Ahmed Kidwai was born in February 1894 to a middle-class Zamindari family in the village of Masauli in Barabanki district of Uttar Pradesh. His family traced its lineage to the entourage of Mohammad Ghazni. In his childhood, he was tutored by his uncle Vilayat Ali. He enrolled in the M.A.O. College at Aligarh in 1916 and successfully graduated with a B.A degree in 1918. He thought of pursuing law studies but was immensely influenced by Mahatma Gandhi's call to join the Non-Cooperation Movement. Once again, his uncle Vilayat Ali served as his mentor to expose him to the two organizations leading the freedom struggle- the Congress and the Muslim League and their main leaders.

Around the time he was studying, a historic session of the Congress and the Muslim League was held at Lucknow, where the Congress-League pact was signed in December 1916. His uncle ensured he participated in such meetings.

It is not surprising then that by 1920, Kidwai had joined the Khilafat organization. He is said to have been the main force behind the Non-Cooperation Movement in Barabanki district. His then served as private secretary to Motilal Nehru. Subsequently, in 1926, he was elected to the Central Legislative Assembly. His political and social acumen and maturity were well-recognized and led to his appointment as Chief Whip of the Congress party in the Central Legislature.

The 1930's were years that saw Kidwai's growing involvement with farmers and agriculturists in his home state, U.P. He used his position, secretary of the U.P Congress Committee, to organize

a no-rent campaign to protect the peasantry from the economic depression that had set in. He was jailed and sentenced in prison for leading this movement but in spite of this, the agrarian movement became a life-time commitment for him.

When Congress governments were established in various provinces under the provincial autonomy scheme introduced in 1937, Kidwai was appointed a minister in Pandit G. B. Pant's U.P. cabinet. He was given charge of the revenue and jail portfolios. He initiated major land reforms in U.P., such as the restructuring of the U.P. Tenancy Act and creating conditions for the abolition of the Zamindari system. He also introduced reforms in jails aiming at making prisoners better citizens.

In April 1946, he became the Home Minister of Uttar Pradesh. Kidwai rose from strength to strength within the party. A close confidante and supporter of Nehru, he was affectionately called "Rafi Sahib".

Post-independence, Kidwai moved base to New Delhi as Minister for Communications. During his tenure, he introduced novel schemes such as the night air mail service in 1948 and own your telephone which still goes by the OYT scheme under which a new telephone connection may be obtained.

After the first general elections in 1952, Nehru inducted Rafi in his cabinet and entrusted him with the food and agriculture portfolio. At this juncture, the country was facing an acute shortage of food and rationing was in vogue. Kidwai applied himself to the problem and converted the man-made scarcity conditions to man-released abundance of food supplies. His work was well-appreciated especially as he created a surplus position without depending on food aid and external controls. He envisaged a self-sufficient India, both insofar as food supply and telecommunications were concerned.

Rafi Ahmed Kidwai was a learned man, whose knowledge went beyond books. He was an excellent manager of men, and applied his bold and imaginative approach to resolve human issues. Secular in thought, simple and sincere in deed, he was a freedom fighter and socialist politician beyond par. When he died in October 1954, possibly of health run down by untiring hard work, he was recognized to have been a man who cared little for material possessions but much for strengthening his country.

His family history went back to about a thousand years, when his ancestor Qazi Kidwa is reputed to have come in the retinue of Mohammad Ghazni. The Kidwais were middle-class zamindars. Rafi's parents, Sheikh Imtiaz Ali and Begum Rashid-ul-Nisa, were devout Muslims. Imtiaz Ali entered Government Service,serving as a Tehsildar and later on as Manager,Courts of Wards.

The Government rewarded Ali's honest and good services by conferring on him the title of Khan Saheb. Imtiaz Ali's only younger brother, Vilayat Ali, was a lawyer of some standing at Barabanki; and after his mother's death Rafi Ahmad shifted, at the age of eight, for schooling to his uncle's house, where he matriculated. Rafi Ahmad had three brothers, one of whom died of a knife-stab during the pre-Independence communal holocaust and the other two survived him.

He was married in 1919 to Begum Majid-ul-Nisa, a lady of considerable beauty, highly orthodox, and who never forsook Pardah. About one year after the marriage a son, the only issue, was born to the couple, who died at the age of seven.

Rafi Ahmad started studies in the village school under Moulvi Imam Ali. At home he was put under the charge of one Haji Chhotak, a strict disciplinarian who would not allow boy Rafi to mix with commoner's children. It was not the father but the uncle who cast the future of Rafi Ahmad. Vilayat Ali was an active member of both the Congress and the Muslim League (the two had not developed hostility at the time), would host national leaders including the famous Ali brothers and Raja Ghazanfar Ali and contribute voluminously to the Comrade and the New Age.

Rafi Ahmad graduated from the M.A.O. College at Aligarh in 1918, but before completing the LL.B. course he fell under the spell of Gandhiji and left the College. Rafi Ahmad did not join any national college or university, but fell headlong into the non-cooperation movement. His radical politics soon attracted the attention of the local authorities, who lodged him in jail for one year. Jail became a second home to him thereafter. On release Rafi Ahmad went to Anand Bhavan, started work as Private Secretary

to Motilal Nehru and virtually became a member of the Nehru family. In 1926 he was elected to the Central Legislative Assembly on Swaraj Party ticket and resigned membership in 1930 at the call of the Congress.

By late 'twenties he had gained sufficient stature to be the Chief Whip of the Congress Party in the Central Legislative, which gave him an opportunity to display his organising capacity and skill in political manouvering. Among the offices held by him in the 'twentities an important one was the Secretaryship of the Reception Committee of the Kanpur session of the Indian National Congress (1925).

After the suspension of the Salt Satyagraha Movement (1931) Rafi Ahmad came to his own, and as Secretary of the U. P. Congress Committee, he spear-headed the agrarian movement. With inimitable skill and ingenuity he organised the no-rent campaign to protect the Oudh peasantry against the economic depression of the thirties. Rafi's bold lead won the confidence of Congessmen and he was elected to the key office of the President of the U.P.C.C. in the crucial year of the first General Elections under the Government of India Act of 1935.

His stewardship of the Congress and victory of Congressmen at the poll carved out for him a permanent place in the party hierarchy. He was a continuous member of the Congress Working Committee, except for the brief interval during Nehru-Tandon controversy. In the first Cabinet of U.P. formed after the 1935 reforms, Rafi Ahmad was appointed Minister of the key portfolio of Land Revenue, when he got an opportunity to give practical shape to his agrarian programme. Rafi Ahmad's economic outlook was radical, and in the Presidential Address to the Unnao Session of the U. P. Congress (1936) he sponsored the theory that complete assurance to the starved and the naked, especially the peasant, would win more support for the battle for freedom than all talks of close-up in the Congress.

Rafi Ahmad's virtual enactment of the U.P. Tenancy Act (it received the Governor's Assent after the Congress Ministry's resignation in 1939) created a firm base for the Congress among the rural masses and created conditions for the abolition of the Zamindari system. He sponsored the resolution accepting the

principle of the abolition of landlordism in the U. P. Assembly. In the U. P. Cabinet formed after the second General Elections (1946) Rafi Ahmad became the Home Minister.

In 1947 Rafi Ahmad's field of activity was shifted to New Delhi, where as the Minister for Communications in the Central Cabinet he distinguished himself by sponsoring the schemes of night-air-mail, own-your-telephone, and paid holiday for postmen. Rafi developed differences on organisational matters and in 1951 resigned membership of the Congress and the Government.

Before the 1952 General Elections there was, however, a reconcillation and Rafi Ahmad won a seat in Parliament from Bahraich as a Congress candidate. In the new Union Cabinet, he was put in charge of the most difficult portfolios-Food and Agriculture. Rafi had reached his apex and feeding the nation without food-aid and controls made him a national hero.

On religion Rafi Ahmad's views were highly unorthodox. He shared Chesterton's belief that organised religion had lost its real contents, and reduced his participation in community prayers on every Friday, to the two annual occasions of Id and Bakr-Id. Rafi Ahmad opposed the orthodox Muslims who wanted to exclude Muslims from the application of the Sarda Act, prescribing the age of consent for girls, on the gorund that it would be a violation of the Shariat Law. He stood for the equality of sexes and freedom of women.

Rafi Ahmad's approach to communal matters was non-religious, that is, he would settle them through far-reaching agreements on fundamental rights, adult suffrage and common electorate. Rafi believed in mass action and mass programmes. Both the Hindu and the Muslim masses suffered equally at the hands of their exploiters, the landlord and the capitalist. Hindu-Muslim unity could thus be achieved through a common struggle to end exploitation.

He stood for complete Independence though by way of compromise he agreed to join the U. P. Cabinet after the 1935 Reforms.

Rafi Ahmad was rather short and stoutly built with a protruding paunch, which did not tend to agility. His loosely fit

achkan and baggy paijama would not add to smartness. He was quiet by nature and austere in living. Undaunted by nature, he would take extreme risks. Highly personal and affectionate, he built numerous lasting friendships. Generous to the core, he was something like a persuasive, non-violent Robin Hood, who would squeeze money out of the rich for the benefit of the poor. As a fund-raiser for the party he was equalled by few. He had no love for worldly possessions, and when he died all the legacy he left was a heavy overdraft and a dilapidated ancestral house, bereft of roofings and doorflaps.

The district of Bareilly lying between Lat. 28 degree 1' and Long. 78 degree 58'k and 79 degree 47'E was once the part of ancient Panchala, which was bound by the river Gomati in the east, Yamuna in the west, Chambal in the south and on the north it approaches the Himalayan foot hills. During the later Vedic period Panchala acquired considerable significance - in fact it became the matrix of Later Vedic Civilization.

According to the Shatapatha Brahamana (XIII 5.4.7-8)the Brahmins who had settled in different parts of Panchala and were being patronised by its Kings were to be counted not by hundreds but by many thousands. At another place' the same text records, "speech sounds higher among the Kuru-Panchalas" - the speech denoting the rectification of Vedic texts. The scholars of Panchala were famous throughout India. It was from Panchala region that the sage Yajnavalkya was invited in the kingdom of Mithila to enlighten king Janaka on various philosophical problems. In the development of Upanisadic philosophy Prayahana Jaivali, Pratardana, Gargayayana and Uddalaka of Panchala had made significant contributions.

In fact it was in this region that during the later Vedic period the Indian life and thought had assumed the form which had followed ever since. There is a story in the Kathakasmhita which reports a debate between Vaka Dalbbhya from Panchala and Dhratarastra Vaichitravirya from Kuru. This contest between the two indicates that whereas the Panchalas had soon realised the futility of sacrifices and were engaged in philosophical discussions, their neighbour Kurus were continuing their faith in rituals and sacrifices. The love for reason in the region of Panchala did not confine to philosophy only. They were ploneers in the domain of Natural Science also.

Uddalaka Aruni of Panchala who could not presumably be later than the 8th or 7th B.C. took the step from the magicomythological view of the scriptures to a naturalistic understanding of nature. He postulated the original cause of the universe the primeval being (Sat), ignoring thereby the word Brahman (identified with spirit) - which was greatly in vogue in the general intellectual climate to which he belonged. He proceeded to sketch a view of the evolution or development of everything in nature ultimately from the primeval being or Sat with a dynamism or motion inherent in it. What strikes us as most remarkable about his procedure is that practically at every step of this sketch, he drew upon empirical data or facts of direct observation, already censored by the priest class.

From archaeological point of view the district of Bareilly is very rich. The extensive remains of Ahichhatra, the Capital town of Northern Panchala have been discovered near Ramnagar Village of Aonla Tehsil in the district. It was during the first excavations at Ahichhatra (1940-44) that the painted grey ware, associated with the advent of the Aryans in Ganga Yamuna Valley, was recognised for the first time in the earliest levels of the site. Nearly five thousand coins belonging to periods earlier than that of Guptas have been yielded from Ahichhatra. It has also been one of the richest sites in India from the point of view of the total yield of terrocotas.

Some of the masterpieces of Indian terrocotta art are from Ahichhatra. In fact the classification made of the terracotta human figurines from Ahichhatra on grounds of style and to some extent stratigraphy became a model for determining the stratigraphy of subsequent excavations at other sites in the Ganga Valley. On the basis of the existing material, the archaeology of the region helps us to get an idea of the cultural sequence from the beginning of the 2nd millenium BC upto 11th C.A.D. Some ancient mounds in the district have also been discovered by the Deptt. of Ancient History and culture, Rohilkhand University, at Tihar-Khera (Fatehganj West), Pachaumi, Rahtuia, Kadarganj and Sainthal.

In the 6th Cent. BC, the Panchala was among one of the sixteen mehajanapadas of India. The experiment in non-monarchical form of Government in Panchala was soon engulfed in the growing Magadhen imperialism - first under the Nandas and then under the Mauryas. The fall of the Mauryan empire saw the emergence of numerous small and independent states in the whole Ganga Valley. It saw a remarkable revival in the fortunes of Panchala which once again came to occupy a very significant position in the history of north India. Panchala emerges at this time as one of the strongest powers in India. About 25 kings who have ruled during this period have left behind thousands of coins. During the period between the fall of the Mauryas and the rise of the Guptas, the Panchalas had two phases of power - first the pre Kushana phase i.e. from C-150 BC to AD 125 and secondly a short period of fifty years after the fall of the Kushanas, which ended in CAD 350 when Panchala was assimilated in the Gupta empire by Samudragupta.

Under the Guptas Ahichhatra was one of the provinces into which the Gupta empire was divided. The material evidence during the Gupta period at Ahichhatra does not give the impression that it was a large and prosperous centre like the preceding phase. The monuments under the Guptas are mainly religious indicating that Ahichhatra had then become mainly a religious centre.

The amalgamation of several religious and popular beliefs may be observed through out the history of Panchala in ancient India. In addition to being associated with the activities of pravahana Jaivali, Gargayayana, Uddalaka etc. responsible for giving a distinctive touch to the later vedic thought, the region was also a prominent centre of popular beliefs such as the cult of Nagas, Yaksas and Vetalas. The Jain tirthamkara Parshvanath is said to have attained Kaivalya at Ahichhatra. The city was also influenced by Buddha and his followers. The remains of Buddhist monastries at Ahichhatra are quite extensive. The echoes of the Bhagavates and the Saivas at Ahichhatrra can still be seen in the towering monuments of a massive temples, which is the most imposing structure of the site.

After the fall of the Guptas in the latter half of the 6th century the district of Bareilly came under the domination of the Maukharis.

Under the emperor Harsha (606-47 AD) the district was the part of the Ahichhatra Bhukti. During Harsha's reign the chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang also visited Ahichhatra about 635 AD. After the death of Harsha this region falls under anarchy and confusion. In the second quarter of eighth century the district was included in the kingdom of Yashavarman (725-52 AD) of Kannauj and after him the Ayudha kings also Kannauj became the masters of the district for several decades. With the rise of the power of the Gurjara Pratiharas in the 9th century, Bareilly came under their sway. It continued under their subordination till the end of the tenth century.

Mahmud of Ghazni gave a death blow to the already decaying Gurjara Pretihara power. After the fall of the Gurjara Pretiharas Ahichhetra ceases to remain a flourishing cultural centre of the region. The seat of the royal power was shifttes from Ahichhatra to Vodamayuta or modern Badaun as the irrefutable evidence of Rashtrakuta Chief Lakhanpalas inscription would have as believe.

About the middle of the twelfth century the Katehriyas seem to have established themselves firmly in the Bareilly region with Kabar and Aonla as their chief centres. They appear to have started as vassals of the Rashtrakutas of Vodamayuta (Badaun) but on the latter's downfall (1195 AD) they declared independence. The Katehriyas are to be noted for their conspicuous role in persistently resisting the onslaught of the Delhi rulers till as late as the time of Akbar. The origin and the rise of the Katehar Rajputs in the region is a mystery and a matter of controversy.

According to the tradition the foundation of the town of Bareilly may be dated some time in the first half of the sixteenth century. It is said that one Jagat Singh katehriya founded a village called Jagtpur about the year 1500. In 1537 his two sons Bas Deo and Barel Deo were responsible for founding Bareilly. The place was named after the two brothers as Bans Bareilly. The name Jagatpur is still retained by one of the mohallas of the old city. During the region of Akbar the Katehriyas rose in revolt but it was crushed by the Mughal general Almas Ali Khan. Bas Deo of Bareilly who was then ruling over a considerable extent of territory was killed and Bareilly was annexed in the Mughal empire. However the Mughal authority did not become effective here till

the afghan nobles who were entrenched in these parts were overthrown.

The development of the city was accelerated in 1657. When the faujdar of Bareilly was Mukrand Rai. He is credited to have built the new city of Bareilly by clearing out the sal forest. The mohalla makrandpur sarkar was named after him and that of AlamgiriGanj after AurangZeb Alamgir. The Mohallas of Beharipur, Malookpur and Kazitola were also founded by him. He also built the Jama Masjid and a large fort were the Qila Police Station is situated.

The proprietary settlements of the district during the period between 1191 to 1701 is difficult to ascertain as most of them were uprooted by the Rohillas but prominent among those clans which were able to retain their power in the district were the Katehriya, Janghara and Chauhan. Some castes Kanrawas, Jatasths and Kodars also had proprietary rights in the district. It was with the immigration of Daud Khan, an Afghan slave(who originally hails from Roh in Afghanistan) in the region that the Afghan Rohillas had come into prominence. His adopted son Ali Muhammad Khan succeeded in carving out an estate for himself in the district with his headquarter at Aonla. He was ultimately made the lawful governor of Kateher by the Mughal emperor, and the region was henceforth called "the land of the Ruhelas".

When the Marathas invaded Rohilkhand in November 1772, they were repulsed by the Rohillas with the help of the nawabs of Avadh. After the war when Shuja-Ud-daula demanded the indemnity from the Rohilla Chief Hafiz Rahmat Khan for the help given to him, the demand was rejected. The annoyed nawab then with the help of Warren Hastings invaded Rohilkhand. In ensuing battle of Mirranpur Katra in 1774, Hafiz Rahmat Khan was killed and the authority of the Avadh was established over the entire territory of the Rohillas. The Avadh supermacy did not continue for long for the mounting debt on account of the maintenance of British forces in the region led to the surrender of the whole of Rohilkhand(including Bareilly) to the East India Company by the treaty of November 10, 1801.

The news of the outbreak of the struggle of independence which started at Meerut reached Bareilly on May 14,1857. The

people rose in revolt, occupied treasury and burnt the records of Kotwali,Khan Bahadur khan, the grandson of Hafiz Rahmat Khan was able to form his own government by appointing Sobha Ram Diwan, Madar Ali Khan and Niyaz Muhammed Khan generals and Hori Lal as paymaster. With the failure of this first war of the Indian independence everywhere, Bareilly too was completely subjugated by the British on 7th May 1858. Khan was sentenced to death and was hanged in the Kotwali on February 24, 1860.

The Indian National Congress came in to prominence in Bareilly during the khilafat movement when Gandhiji visited this town twice and many Hindus and Muslims were arrested. In response to the call given by Gandhiji, the Civil Disobedience Movement in the district was launched on Jan 26,1930. In 1936, a conference of the Congress was held in Bareilly under the presidentship of Acharya Narendra Deo. It was addressed by Jawaharlal Nehru, M.N.Roy, Purushottam Das Tandon and Rafi Ahmad Kidwai. In 1942 when the 'Quit India' movement was launched, many processions and meetings were organised and nearly 200 persons were arrested. More prominent among them were Damodar Swaroop Seth, Brijmohan Lal Shastri, P.C.Azad, Rammurti, Naurang Lal, Chiranjivi Lal, Udho Narain D.D. Vaidya and Darbari Lal Sharma. In the Bareilly central Jail at that time were confined such prominent leaders as Jawahar Lal Nehru. Rafi Ahmad Kidwai, Mahavir Tyagi, Manzar Ali Sokhata and Maulana Hifazul Rahman.

13

M. A. Ansari

The ancestors of Mukhtar Ahmad Ansari came to India during the reign of Sultan Muhammad Bin Tughlaq. The family started its career serving in the royal army and holding respectable posts in the court. It settled at Yusufpur, now in the Ghazipur District of U.P. The Ansaris of Yusufpur managed to hold respectable governmental positions. But by the time Mukhtar Ahmad Ansari was born on December 25, 1880, the prosperity of the family was on the decline. Graduating from the Victoria High School, Ghazipur in 1896 Mukhtar Ahmad moved to Hyderabed where his two brothers were in the service of the Nizam, for his university education.

Immediately after his graduation in medical science from Madras Medical College, Mukhtar Ahmad proceeded to England on a Nizam State Scholarship for higher medical education. He qualified for M.D. and M.S. in 1905, topping the list of successful candidates, by virtue of which he was the only Indian to be appointed Registrar, Lock Hospital, London. Later he was taken as the House Surgeon at the Charing Cross Hospital, London. The hospital acknowledged Dr. Ansari's outstanding services in the field of surgery by opening a ward in his name as the Ansari Ward.

During his long and fruitful stag in England Dr. Ansari was drawn into the Indian national scene by meeting and developing intimate relations with some Indian national leaders who used to visit London quite frequently. It was in London that he met and became a life-long friend of Motilal Nehru, Hakim Ajmal Khan and young Jawaharlal.

In spite of the ample opportunities for him to continue in a comfortable life abroad Dr. Mukhtar Ahmad Ansari returned home in 1910. After a short may at Hyderabed and his home town, Yusufpur, he established his medical practice in Delhi. Soon after, Dr. Ansari started taking part in active politics. The first move in this direction was his leading, in December 1912, the Ansari Medical Mission to Turkey to provide medical and surgical aid to the fighting Turkish army in the Balkan War. Although the mission was organised by Muslim leaders, it paved the way for the Indian national leaders to put India on the world map by advocating and fostering international understanding.

This was the period when the Congress and the Muslim League were close in their political goals and one did not find it difficult to express oneself simultaneously from both the platforms. Thus, Dr. Ansari succeeded in establishing himself in both circles, and played an important role in the Lucknow Pact of 1916 in which the Muslim League and the Congress agreed upon the idea of proportional representation. In 1918 he presided over the annual session of the Muslim League held at Delhi. His Presidential Address was proscribed by the Government because of his bold and fearless stand in it for the cause of the Khilafat and his unconditional support to the demand for complete freedom. Again in 1920 he was the President of the Nagpur session of the All-India Muslim League; at Nagpur also met at the same time the Indian National Congress under the president-ship of Vijayaraghavachariar of Madras, and the All-India Khilafat Committee with Maulana Abul Kalam Azad as its President. A joint session of all the three organisations was held.

Like in the Muslim League, Dr. Ansari held a high position in the Congress also. For almost all through his life he was member of its Working Committee. He was its General Secretary in the years 1920, 1922, 1926, 1929, 1931 and 1932, and President in 1927 (Madras Session). On question of entry in the Council to the government from inside Dr. Ansari remained with Gandhiji in the camp of the 'no-changers' who were against the entry. His personal relationship, however remained unsevered with the 'pro-changers', prominent among them being Pandit Motilal Nehru and Vithalbhai Patel. His Delhi Palatial house, 'Darus-salam', the Abode of Peace,

was for all practical purposes like Congress House. Gandhiji used to stay there whenever he visited Delhi.

Although part of the inner circle Indian national life Dr. Anari also had access to the inner circle of the British bureaucracy in India. Thus, he often came to know in advance governmental decisions regarding prominent national leaders and was able to alert them in time non-cooperation days he took a keen interest in the establishment of independent national institutions for higher education, two them being the Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi and the Kashi Vidyapith at Benares. From its inception on October 29, 1920 Jamia Millia Islamia had the unconditional support of Dr. Absari. He was elected its Chancellor after the death of its firm Chancellor, Hakim Ajmal Khan.

Impressed by the political and social services of her husband Mrs. Ansari a devout and orthodox Muslim, also took a keen interest in the uplift of Delhi Women.

On the night of May 10, 1936 when he was returning from Mussoorie where he had gone to pay a professional visit to the Nawab of Rampur, Dr. Ansari heart beat for the lad time in the railway compartment. The news reached Delhi before the train brought his body back which was finally laid to rest in the lap of his beloved Jamia Millia Islamia.

In popular and journalist writings by non-Muslim writers and in the virulent propaganda of Hindu extremist groups Islamic seminaries or madrasas are routinely painted as raining grounds of 'anti-national' 'terrorists'. Rebuttals by Muslim leaders and by the 'ulama of the madrasas, however,generally go ignored in the press, thus reinforcing the deeply rooted stereotypical images about them.

A dispassionate reading of early twentieth century Indian history reveals that, in contrast to both theMuslim League, on the one hand, and Hindu supremacists, including right-wing elements within the Congress party, on the other, both of whom supported British imperialism in their own ways, numerous 'ulama were in the forefront of the Indian freedom movement. Many of them were ardent advocates of a united India, opposing the communalism of both the League and the Hindu Mahasabha and

Hindu chauvinist Elements within the Congress. Unfortunately, this is totally ignored in both popular writings as well as in Indian history textbooks, thus further reinforcing the widespread, though baseless, notion of Muslims as 'traitors' and 'enemies' of the country.

In the fight for India's freedom, leading 'ulama of Dar ul-'Ulum madrasa at Deoband, which is today routinely branded as an 'ultra-conservative' bastion and reviled as allegedly being the nerve centre of global Islamic 'terrorism', appear to have played a pioneering role.

Indeed, leading Deobandis seem to have launched a movement for a free and united India before the emergence of Gandhi as a populist leader and of the Congress as a mass organisation. In 1909, Maulana Mahmud ul-Hasan, the then head of the Deoband madrasa, set up the Jami'at ul-Ansar, an association of old boys of Deoband, and deputed one of his most trusted students, a Sikh convert to Islam, Maulana 'Ubaidullah Sindhi (1872-1944), to head it. In 1915, Mahmud ul-Hasan directed Sindhi to head for Afghanistan, where he set up a provisional government of free India, along with several Indian Hindu and Muslim revolutionaries associated with the Ghadr Party and the Congress.

Meanwhile, in 1916, in order to mobilize Turkish support for his programme of an independent India, Mahmud ul-Hasan left for the Hijaz. However, Arab nationalists opposed to Ottoman rule betrayed him to the British, who then arrested him and some of his associates in Mecca and imprisoned them in Malta. Soon after his release some years later, heissued a fatwa supporting the Non-Cooperation movement of the Congress, appealing to Muslims to wholeheartedly participate in it. The fatwa was later endorsed by almost 500 'ulama.

Shortly after, with the end of the First World War, Indian Muslim leaders launched the Khilafat movement in order to preserve the Ottoman Caliphate from attack by the victorious allies and to prevent the holy cities of Mecca and Medina from falling under European control.

The Khilafat movement provided a new lease of life to the 'ulama, who had been, by this time, increasingly marginalized by western-educated Muslims as leaders of the community. An

influential section of the Deobandis, fiercely opposed to what they saw as the 'secular', 'irreligious' and 'pro-British' Jinnah and the Muslim League, willingly joined hands with Gandhi, whose use of religious appeals they could easily identify with.

These 'ulama sensed that 'modernist' Muslims, and those, such as many in the League, who employed Islam simply as a tool for their own secular interests, were a major challenge to their own authority, while Gandhi's willingness to work with them and even accept them as 'representatives' of Islam, would strengthen their own claims to speak for the Muslim community as a whole.

In 1919 a group of 'ulama, mostly Deobandis, set up the Jami'at ul-'Ulama-i Hind ('The Union of the 'Ulama of India'). The immediate reason for the formation of the Jami'at was to protect the Ottoman Caliphate from the threat of dismemberment at the hands of rival European powers.

Jami'at leaders insisted that the Caliphate was an integral part of Islam, linking Muslims living all over the world as members of a universal ummah. They exhorted Muslims to actively struggle for safeguarding the Caliphate, appealing to them to sacrifice their all for what they described as a central pillar of the faith. Some even went to the extent of declaring India under the British to be dar ul-harb ('abode of war'), calling for Muslims in government service to quit their jobs and appealing to Muslims in general to migrate to Afghanistan. Khilafat committees were set up all over the country, organized by 'ulama in collaboration with modern educated Muslims, thus helping bring about a temporary reconciliation between the two.

Taking advantage of the growing anti-British sentiment among the 'ulama, Gandhi and other senior Congress leaders jumped onto the Khilafat bandwagon, and soon Gandhi had emerged as the leader of the Khilafatists, spearheading the cause of the Caliph, insisting that Self-Rule and the Caliphate were inseparable. Leading Deobandi 'ulama issued a series of fatwas declaring that in 'worldly matters', such as for the sake of protecting the Khilafat and freeing India of the British, Muslims were permitted to cooperate with Hindus, provided, however, that this did not violate any principles of the shari'ah.

Leading Deobandi scholars bitterly critiqued the League's 'two-nation' theory and what they saw as the 'irreligiousness' of the leaders of the party, particularly Jinnah. The rector of the Deoband madrasa, Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani, wrote a lengthy polemical tract targeting the Muslim League, arguing that in Islam nationality (qaumiyat) was determined by common homeland and not by religion.

He sought sanction for this view from the example of the Prophet, quoting early Islamic history to stress his point. The proto-state set up by the Prophet in Medina, he wrote, accorded equal rights to Muslims, Jews and pagan Arabs, and they were all regarded as members of one ummah. Accordingly, Madani argued, the Hindus and Muslims of India were members of a common nation. Like many of his fellow Deobandis, Madani believed that in a free and united India Muslims would be able to lead their personal lives in accordance with the shari'ah, while also cooperating with people of other faiths in matters of common concern.

Leading Deobandis were not the only 'ulama to support the cause of a united India. The leading scholar of the Firangi Mahal madrasa, Maulana 'Abdul Bari, who led the Khilafat movement, had close links with the Congress, particularly in his capacity of the first president of the Jami'at ul-'Ulama-i Hind. Another member of the family, Mufti Raza, served for many years as editor of "Qaumi Awaz", an Urdu newspaper launched by Jawaharlal Nehru.

Maulana Hayatullah Firangi Mahali edited the Congress paper Hindustan, and his relative Dr. M.A. Ansari, a close associate of Gandhi, was a senior Congress leader and even served as its president for a while. Yet other members of the family were active in the Communist Party and in the 'progressive writers' movement, such as Khwaja Ahmad Abbas.

In other words, the 'ulama of the madrasas were hardly the diehard 'fanatics' that they are generally accused of being. In religious matters they might have been, on the whole, conservative, but in political affairs they displayed a surprising degree of pragmatism, and many of them were fierce advocates of a united

and free India. This continues to be the case, by and large, even today. One might not approve entirely of the madrasas and of the 'ulama, and, one may have serious differences with the uncritical support lent by leading Deobandis to the Congress, which, as the experience of independent India has shown, has done little for the Muslim masses, and, indeed, has been complicit in their further marginalisation.

However, to accuse the 'ulama, especially the Deobandis, of actively working for the disintegration of India and spreading terror is entirely misplaced. ridiculous. The 'ulama, particularly the Deobandis, have adequate reason to take pride in their contributions to the freedom struggle. Hindutva groups, who, as numerous scholars have shown, actively collaborated with British imperialism and opposed the joint struggle for India's freedom, can least afford to condemn them as 'enemies' of the country.

14

E.M.S Namboodripad

It is hard to define what makes a truly great leader but E.M.S. Namboodiripad was never in doubt about it. He said once, "Individuals become leaders only because they serve the people of the country. The minute they start doing something else, the minute they drop their ideals and ideology and work against their party or the people, they cease to be leaders."

EMS is among the rare Indian leaders who abided by this rule through his public life that lasted more than seven decades. His prescient presence as leader, thinker and theoretician played a pre-eminent role in shaping a modern and cohesive Kerala out of its unsettling political and social history. His tireless efforts as an analyst and commentator helped evolve a form of Communism that suited Indian conditions.

EMS visits his ancestral home, Elankulam 'mana', in October 1996 after a gap of 25 years.

In idealism and exhaustive pursuit of ideology, EMS stands out as a model for political India. He thought differently from his contemporaries, lived dangerously to overcome the limitations of his times and worked constantly for the freedom of the individual and society from the clutches of imperialism, feudalism, fanatic casteism and, more recently, abhorrent communalism.

BORN on June 13, 1909, EMS was the son of Elankulam Manakkal Parameswaran Namboodiripad, a Sanskrit scholar, and Vishnudatta. Theirs was an aristocratic Namboodiri family in Perinthalamanna taluk of the present Malappuram district. EMS had four sisters and three brothers; two brothers died soon after

birth and an older brother had a mental disability. He lost his father at a very early age.

EMS was affectionately called Kunju (the little one). As was the custom, Kunju's early education was at home. He was imparted a rigorous, ritualistic training in Sanskrit language and literature, logic and the scriptures. Later, he was taught Malayalam, Hindi and English. His mother and his Sanskrit teacher, Agnitratan, influenced him in his early years. It is said that his mother was keen to make him a Sanskrit scholar and wanted him to excel in the anyonyams (vedic recitation contests). This was not to be. Kunju insisted that he be sent to school. About his education at home and his experiences as a schoolboy at Perinthalmanna, EMS recalled later:

"Even those who completed such a system of education (at home) would not understand the Rig Veda because students were required only to learn by rote the various sooktas and not their meaning... I felt I had started a new life when I joined the school. An entirely new atmosphere than what I was used to. Members from all castes and communities were my fellow students and teachers. Learning was not alone but together, in groups of 25 to 30 students."

EMS' earliest struggles were against the feudal system to which he belonged. V.T. Bhattathiripad, M.B. Bhattathiripad and the young revolutionary EMS were responsible for awakening the Namboodiri community to new social realities. Those lower down in the caste hierarchy, such as the Pulaya, Ezhava and Nair communities, had already experienced the stirrings of social change. They launched a journal Unninamboothiri in which EMS published for the first time his progressive ideas - radical for the times.

EMS became an assistant secretary of the Valluvanadu Yogaskshema Sabha, an organisation of Namboodiri youth that fought against the retrograde customs in the community. At 16, he became the secretary of the Yogakshema Sabha and campaigned vigorously for liberating Namboodiri women from oppressive customs. In 1931, EMS took the initiative for the first widow remarriage in the Namboodiri community for which he was "ostracised", ineffectively though. He organised picketing at venues

where old men tried to marry young girls and collected funds to fight the karanavars, the heads of traditional matrilineal families, who would not allow their wards enough means even for a decent education.

When EMS began college, Travancore and Cochin were coming alive to the national freedom movement. He abandoned his degree course to join the Independence movement. Even as a schoolboy, Namboodiripad went to Madras to attend the All India Congress Committee (AICC) conference. Later, he attended the Payyannur conference of the AICC, which was inaugurated by Jawaharlal Nehru whose socialist leanings within the Indian National Congress had attracted EMS' admiration.

After 1932, EMS devoted his energy to fighting British imperialism and this was a period when he was either incarcerated or forced into hiding. The experience gave EMS the opportunity to meet freedom-fighters from different parts of the country. While in jail at Kannur and Vellore, he established links with socialist leaders within the Congress. In 1934, he joined the Congress Socialist Party. EMS retained links with the Pradesh Congress Committee and attracted national attention when he was elected PCC secretary. A majority of the newly elected PCC members supported the Left-socialist viewpoint, unlike the PCCs in other parts of the country.

Even when he worked as the PCC secretary, EMS had doubts about the effectiveness of Gandhi's peaceful agitations to achieve social revolution and freedom. His meeting with P. Krishna Pillai in the Kozhikode sub jail helped him substantiate his critical outlook regarding Gandhi's vision. The two of them began to work closely together, first as leaders of the Congress Socialist Party and later as leaders of the Communist Party. Organiser Krishna Pillai, legendary mass leader A.K. Gopalan and EMS founded and built the Communist movement in Kerala.

By the end of 1937, EMS was again elected to the PCC but soon right-wing Congress leaders prevented anybody with left leanings to contest the elections to the Madras Legislative Assembly. At a time when many Congress leaders were lured by power and position, EMS and his small group of comrades campaigned to make ordinary workers and peasants politically

conscious about social inequities and Communist ideals. EMS was elected to the Madras Provincial Legislative Assembly in a byelection and became a member of the inquiry committee established to study the tenancy relations in the Malabar region in 1939. When the Congress members reached a consensus in favour of the landlords, EMS presented the lone dissenting note in favour of the tenants. This was the harbinger of the most comprehensive land reforms in South Asia for which EMS provided the initiative nearly two decades later.

In 1940, the British Government banned the Communist Party. Communist leaders in Malabar went underground. About his years in hiding, EMS later recalled:

"April 1940 was a turning point in my life. Seven months had passed since the Second World War began. All of us were engaged in anti-War activities. The party decided we should go into hiding. One night, I left home without telling even my wife. I left her and our one-year-old daughter. Nobody knew for how long a period. It created a lot of tension inside me... in another way it was a happy occasion. For the first time in my life I could establish a heart-to-heart relationship with ordinary people who were not members of my community - peasants, farm and fish workers, the poor. Until then my relationship with them was only in my mind. It had not touched my heart."

No ordinary Namboodiri would have dared to rub shoulders with the "untouchables", the ordinary farm workers, peasants and their families, eat meat and fish with them and become a part of their lives for days on end. But EMS' work was to be among the lower castes, untouchable labourers and ordinary workers. In his lifetime, EMS was a significant force in the social revolution that transformed Kerala from an obnoxious past when untouchability and unapproachability were practised to the equitable society that it is today.

In 1947, soon after he emerged from hiding, EMS announced the sale of his family estate and donated the handsome proceeds to the Communist Party. The party used this amount to relaunch the defunct Desabhimani as a daily newspaper in 1947 and EMS was made the Editor. Desabhimani, which was first launched in 1942 as a weekly, had been banned by the British.

In his autobiography, EMS said that the changes that he underwent at a personal level were as important as the social changes that he was instrumental in bringing about. He noted, "Although I was born in a family that was at the top of the caste-ridden feudal society, I grew up as a Communist and a party worker who was engaged in ridding society of the evils of casteism and feudalism. I evolved further so as to sell my huge estates and donate the entire proceeds for the party. This is what made me the adopted son of the working class."

In 1957, the world's first elected Communist Government came to power in Kerala. Within a week, the EMS-led Government introduced an ordinance (and later legislation) that fixed an absolute ceiling on the land a family could own and ordered distribution of all excess lands to the landless. It also granted fixity of tenure, freedom from eviction and the benefit of a fair rent to be set by impartial land tribunals. Cultivator-tenants were conferred the right to buy at a modest payment and over a phased period the title deed of the land that they worked. The land rights of unauthorised hutment dwellers were defined.

Vested interests opposed the legislation, which together with the Education Bill passed by the EMS Government created a dramatic change in society. The result was one of the first dismissals of a State Government under Article 356 of the Constitution. This was engineered by Prime Minister Jawaharal Nehru at the behest of his daughter Indira Gandhi who was then the Congress president, alleging a breakdown of law and order in the State.

As required by court, the Act was later replaced by another law which contained the provisions of the earlier Act. Two successive non-Communist Governments did not implement this new law, which was challenged in the court on the grounds that it contravened the fundamental rights. During the second tenure of the Communist Government in 1967-69, the EMS Government placed a new land reform (Amendment) Act before the legislature, which restored and amplified the radical proposals in the Kerala Agrarian Relations Act, 1960. Through major amendments, the land that could be held under ceiling was reduced and the jenmi system abolished. The new Act, the Kerala Land Reforms (Amendment) Act, was passed without a dissenting note in 1969.

EMS was also the architect of Aikya Keralam (unified Kerala) incorporating the erstwhile princely states of Travancore and Cochin and parts of the British Malabar districts. He argued that a division of the country into States should be solely on the basis of language and cultural affinity of the people living in a region, and this was based on the declared policy of his party at that time.

EMS steered the progressive literary and intellectual movement in Kerala and made his mark also as the first Marxist historian in the State. The progressive literary movement evoked a social response and achieved a sincerity of approach to people's problems. It encouraged the creation of outstanding works in all areas of Malayalam literature.

These years were also spent shaping the party newspaper, Desabhimani. In April 1997, soon after the daily launched its fifth edition, EMS told Frontline: "When Desabhimani was started...the Communists were a small but committed group in Kerala, pursuing a political line (against the British war efforts) that isolated them from the people. The original objective of the paper was therefore to give publicity to the party's line and to answer criticism against it." For a long time it was a party paper meant only for party members, but Desabhimani, which grew under the constant guidance of Namboodiripad, is today the fourth largest circulated Malayalam daily.

The last important phase in EMS' life was his evolution as Marxist thinker and theoretician, especially after the Communist Party of India (CPI) split in 1964. Even as his closest associates faded away into history, EMS guided the movement through the thick and thin of Indian politics. He was elected to the CPI Central Committee in 1941 and to the party Polit Bureau in 1950. In 1962, he was elected general-secretary of the undivided CPI. In 1964, after the party split, he was elected a Polit Bureau member of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), a post that he held until the very end. He was the CPI(M) general-secretary from 1977 to 1992, when he returned to Kerala on account of failing health.

Even after his return to Thiruvananthapuram, he continued his hectic schedule as party idealogue and writer. The handsome income that he generated through his writings went to the party, which in turn looked after his spartan personal needs.

In the last one year, EMS often expressed his concerns about the development crisis in Kerala and said that the acclaimed Kerala model was insufficient to address urgent developmental needs. He prescribed decentralisation of power and involving people from all walks of life irrespective of political affiliations for the all-round development of the State. The State Government incorporated his suggestions in the People's Campaign for the Ninth Plan. EMS, who was the chairman of the high-level guidance committee formed to implement the campaign, is known to have complained at the committee's last meeting in September 1997 about the slow implementation of the programme.

Until his last day, EMS remained active. A few hours before his death, he dictated two articles to his personal assistant, Venu. One was on the need for a joint effort to fight the forces that threaten secularism in the country - coincidentally on the day the Bharatiya Janata Party ascended to power at the Centre - and the other on "Desabhimani's responsibility today", to mark the anniversary of the newspaper's Kottayam edition.

No tribute can do justice to the glorious and multi-faceted life led by EMS - anti-imperialist, social reformer, literary critic, Marxist thinker, theoretician and historian, and above all a person loved and held in esteem by millions of people.

EMS Namboodiripad (1909-1998) is dead, but his ideals are alive to inspire the younger generations of the sub–continent. Hindu mythology perceives death as a trans-migrational phenomenon through which the soul (which is never born and never dies) merely enters a new body. And that is how the life cycle continues, the world carries on.

Since the soul never dies, after its transmigration, a 'dead' person is eulogised and rarely suggested to criticism. The obituaries written after EMS' death are quite in consonance with this age-old Hindu tradition. But that is a Hindu tradition, not a Dalit one. The Dalit tradition makes it mandatory to see the past with a critical temper for only then can a better future can be visualised. This Dalit tradition compels us to see EMS as he was in his socio–political context. The April 17, 1998 issue of Frontline has EMS as its cover story. Many have aired their views on EMS and his contribution to Indian society. The magazine's editorial titled

"Thinker, Doer, History Maker". The CPI(M) general secretary, Harkishan Singh Surjeet, describes EMS as a model for all revolutionaries and asserts that "he showed a new path to the entire world through the introduction of land reforms". R. Krishana Kumar, in his article, declares EMS' land reform model as the "most comprehensive land reform is South Asia. V. K. Ramachandran quotes statistics to show how Kerala's model of development, a product of EMS' vision, could be a model for all of India. Prabhat Patnaik, a noted economist, asserts, "EMS' interest in planning was enthusiastic in the extreme."

Most obituaries which have appeared in English newspapers have invariably lauded EMS for his most 'radical' ideas on land reform and its implementation in Kerala. EMS was chief minister of Kerala twice and the Left has ruled the state for around 17 years. Therefore Kerala must best reflect EMS' 'grand vision'. If EMS is indeed responsible for the formulation of land reforms policy for India, in general, or Kerala, in particular, then he should definitely be held responsible for the landowning pattern amongst Dalits in Kerala.

Of the total Dalit Main Work Force engaged in the primary sector of the state's economy (1991), 77.16 per cent SCs and 71 per cent STs were landless agricultural labourers as against their all India average of 63.54 percent and 36.32 per cent! With India having been ruled for around 45 five years by the rightist Congress, facts indicate that EMS' Kerala model lags far behind the Congress model of development.

In terms of size of landholdings, while 91.96 per cent non-Dalit landholdings fall in the marginal category, 99.36 per cent of SC and 82.91 per cent of ST land fall in this category. In other words, virtually the entire Dalit population in Kerala's agrarian economy does not own sources of sustenance!

Let's take another yardstick to understand the Kerala model of development. In economics, is well–acknowledged that a rising share of the secondary and tertiary sectors in relation to the primary sector in the Gross Domestic Product indicates modernisation and economic progress. On that count, Kerala is indeed a role model for the rest of India.

Howsoever honest, dynamic, and intellectually versatile he may have been, EMS' thesis on land reform has deprived millions of Dalit masses from precious land resources.

As per the census report of 1991, of the state's total non–Dalit Main Work Force, 56 per cent is in the secondary and tertiary Sectors. This is much higher than the all–India average (38 percent). For this spectacular performance of Kerala, EMS? heer leaders would surely give credit to none other than their departed leader. In that case, should they not be prepared to apportion blame too to EMS for the relative position of Dalits?

Of the total Dalit MWF in the state, a mere 30 per cent of the SCs and 10 per cent STs are in the secondary and tertiary sectors. This only means that the Dalit work force in the state has not experienced the same, or nearly the same, rate of shift as the non–Dalit work force. In this respect, it is not Kerala but Gujarat that emerges as a role model with 44 per cent of the SCs in the secondary and tertiary sectors. And this is despite the fact that Gujarat lags behind Kerala by 10 per cent in terms of the percentage of its non–Dalit MWF being in these sectors.

In terms of the degree of disparity (the work force shift from primary to other sectors) at the all–India level there is a gap of 15 and 28 points respectively between the SCs/ STs and others. But in case of Kerala the gap is much higher — 26 and 44 points respectively. Who should be held accountable for this phenomenon, if not EMS and his much-lauded model of development?

Much hype has been generated about Kerala's high literacy rate, which again is attributed to EMS' model. Would the apologists of EMS tell us what the literacy rate of Kerala was at the time of its formation? Was it lower than the all–India literacy rate ?

On the question of radical social change, EMS is known for his crusade to liberate Namboodiri women from oppressive customs, promoting widow remarriage and campaigning against child–marriage. The social evils EMS fought against were indeed evils and he deserves credit for that. But the question remains why in EMS' ranking of social evils, untouchability was definitely lower down the order! What social vision of the greatest 'communist' India has produced!

The fact is that in his vision, Dalit liberation had no place. Ever since the government of India Act (1935) came into being, and prospects of independence had brightened, the question of land reform emerged as an issue of intense debate. In the Lucknow (April 1936) annual conference of the Congress Party, Pandit Nehru spoke of eliminating the feudal autocracy. But the Congress could not evolve a clear policy of land reform even though the 'radical' section within the party was insisting on land to the tenants.

When he was a member of the inquiry committee established in 1939 to study tenancy relations in the Malabar region, EMS' note of dissent ultimately evolved into a thesis to guide the land reform policy all over India. This radical (read reactionary) vision of EMS sealed the fate of majority of the Dalit populace of the country. This is because Dalits were, in general, not tenants, but landless agricultural labourers.

Ambedkar at that time had comprehended the hidden agenda of the progressives, and constantly argued for his land to the tiller thesis. In his "State and Minorities" (1942), essentially a memorandum prepared on behalf All India Scheduled Caste Federation and submitted to the constituent Assembly, Dr. Ambedkar had argued that:

(a) agriculture will be a state industry;

(b) the state, after taking over land from the Zamidars/ Zagirdars will suitably compensate the former owners in the form of debentures;

(c) the state will re–organise the rural populace into co–operatives and standard size land holdings will be leased out to them;

(d) land-labour relations will be such that there will be no landlords, no tenants and no landless agricultural labourers in India.

Such was the land-labour thesis of Dr.Ambedkar, on which the Indian Left never agreed. Noted Marxist scholars such as Prabhat Patnaik and Ashok Mitra should tell us what was Lenin's view on land-labour relations in the then Soviet Union or Mao's in China?

Last but not the least, was EMS unaware of the social identity of various social segments and their linkages with the land–labour relationships: upper varnas as land owners, upper shudras (middle castes) as tenants, and untouchables as landless agricultural labourers? Was he unaware of the percentage share of various social categories in Kerala's total population? Dalits constitute 10 of the state's total population, Brahmins are far less in number.

For a successful electoral strategy, a political party with no vision of radical social transformation must logically cultivate the largest social block. In case of Kerala, it meant the erstwhile shudras. In doing so, one can afford to theoretically oppose Brahmin supremacy without doing any real damage in real life. At the same time, while theoretically speaking for the Dalits, you can cripple their upward mobility by evolving anti–emancipatory policies.

EMS's socio–political doctrine throughout his political life hovered around mobilising the middle castes (shudras). That doctrine of EMS found its purest expression in Kerala and West Bengal, and that accounts for the Left's success in the two states. Howsoever honest, dynamic, and intellectually versatile he may have been, EMS' thesis on land reform has deprived millions of Dalit masses from precious land resources. Dalits will always remember him as their villain Number One.

If EMS was born in South Africa, and an anti-apartheid approach was not his passion, he may not have been described even as an average democrat. But in a country like India, even after treating untouchables as untouchables, a person like him becomes the 'greatest' revolutionary. Long live his socialism!

Many commentaries have been published on the life and work of EMS Namboodiripad after his death on March 19, 1998. The more one reads about his multi-faceted contributions, the more one's respect and administration grows. He was an outstanding Marxist, who dedicated his whole life to the Communist movement. All his life and energies were spent in the cause of national independence and socialism. This issue of The Marxist is dedicated to his memory. EMS penned thousands of pages on a host of subjects. They dealt mainly with the rise and the development of the national movement, the impact of socialist

ideas in our country and on various aspects of Marxist philosophy, political economy and the social sciences. All these were intended to help and guide the revolutionary movement of the working class; to enable it to make a concrete analysis and chart out the correct course.

EMS Namboodiripad was born into a upper-caste, landlord family of Namboodiri brahmins. At a very young age he began reacting to the environment in which he lived -- the caste-ridden Kerala society and began advocating social reforms. Very soon he was drawn into the national liberation struggle as a young student. He was able to see that the oppressive social order was being protected by the British imperialists and their stooges the local princes. This was the period when Gandhi had already emerged on the national scene. A big upsurge had begun after the adoption of the Lahore resolution in 1930 calling for complete independence. This slogan was able to draw the peasants, workers, students and youth into the national movement. EMS also plunged into the movement.

It was a time when Shaheed Bhagat Singh and his colleagues were on their way to martyrdom in 1931. In his final testament, Bhagat Singh renounced terrorism and expressed the belief that the socialist revolution was the only path for the liberation of mankind. This announcement had a big impact all over the country. Two years later, the withdrawal of the civil disobedience movement caused great disillusionment among the people, particularly the young. Congressmen who were influenced by socialist ideas decided to form the Congress Socialist Party in 1934. EMS was one of the organisers at that time alongwith Jayprakash Narain, Acharya Narendra Dev and others. EMS headed the Kerala unit. The Meerut prisoners were released by that time and the Central Committee of the Communist Party had started functioning openly. EMS came in contact with the Communists working in the Congress Socialist Party and began studying Marxist classics. By this time the All India Kisan Sabha was also set up. In this move too, EMS was one of the initiators.

The Seventh Congress of the Communist International made corrections to the approach to be adopted by the Communist Parties towards the bourgeois-led national liberation movements.

The Sixth Congress had taken a sectarian approach and the Communists as an organised forced remained outside the national liberation movements led by the bourgeoisie and was critical of them. In India, however, in the absence of an organised Communist centre, at many places, communists were active inside the Congress. In 1935 there was a total change in the orientation of the Communists. They started working inside the Congress Party, while side by side developing mass and class organisations of workers, peasants, students, youth etc. Though Nehru had agreed for the direct affiliation of these organisations to the Congress, Vallabhai Patel and others seriously objected and finally this could not come about.

Madras was a composite state at that time and comprised the bulk of the present Tamilnadu, parts of the present Andhra Pradesh and the Malabar area of Kerala. Units of the Communist Party had been formed in some places in Madras province at the initiative of P. Sundarayya. Amir Haider, a dock worker from Western Punjab (who died a few years ago in Pakistan) took the initiative to develop contacts with Communist workers. He was in touch with Ghate and P. Sundarayya. Com. EMS working alongwith the Communists inside the Congress and the All India Kisan Sabha became one of the organisers of the Communist Party in Kerala. In the beginning four comrades joined the illegal party in 1937. They were P. Krishna Pillai, N.C. Shekar, K. Damodaran and EMS.

This was a turning point in the life of EMS. He had by his own experience and study come to be influenced by the October Revolution and had begun to study Marxist books, which were not readily available in those days. His study of historical materialism inspired him to undertake an in-depth study of the history of Kerala society. This study further convinced him of the necessity for a socialist revolution. It is this deep conviction which helped him to take the whole Kerala unit of the CSP alongwith him to join the illegal Communist Party. When the ban on the Communist Party was withdrawn in 1942 and the first Congress of the CPI held in 1943, Com. EMS was elected to its Central Committee. He made a big contribution during this period, paying particular attention to the study of the agrarian question and

formulating the policies of the Party in this respect. The post-war period, was a bad time for the Party, due to certain political mistakes committed by it. However, in Kerala, the Party was able to win over more and more sections of the people and emerge as a political force. The Left-sectarian approach damaged the Party a lot. The functioning of the mass organisations also became difficult in this period.

The Kerala unit of the Party led by EMS constantly emphasised on the need to build the unity of the working class and the peasantry to carry forward the agrarian revolution to success. During the anti-imperialist struggle, this linkage was never overlooked. As a result, the Kerala Communists concentrated on developing the peasant movement and later in post-independent India on organising the agricultural labour. The agricultural workers movement is the strongest in Kerala today.

Comrade EMS was one of the pioneers who launched the struggle for the reorganisation on linguistic basis. The Aikya Kerala movement led by him was successful in uniting the Travancore-Cochin princely states into one whole, Kerala. The Congress party, which had during the course of the freedom struggle promised organisation of states on a linguistic basis and had even formed its provincial committees on this basis, went back on its commitment. The Left took the lead in developing a powerful movement for the linguistic reorganisation of states. This forced the Central Government to set up the States Reorganisation Commission.

It was this tireless work by EMS and his comrades in Kerala that saw the Party emerging victorious in the first ever elections held to the Kerala Legislative Assembly in 1957, soon after the Kerala State was constituted. When EMS became the Chief Minister, he proved himself to be an able administrator. Many measures particularly the land reforms legislation and education bill became a source of inspiration all over the country. The impact that this government had on the people of Kerala and in the rest of the country can be gauged from the fact that the Congress ruling at the Centre undemocratically dismissed his government. When EMS toured the whole country after the dismissal, the mass response was immense with the democratic-minded people in the

whole country condemning this action of the Centre. Comrade EMS was elected to the Polit Bureau in 1953-54 at the third Congress of the CPI. Subsequently, he became editor of the CPI organ New Age and also became General Secretary of the Party after the death of Ajoy Ghosh. In the struggle against revisionism within the CPI which began in 1954 and which culminated in the formation of the CPI(M), EMS while disassociating from the revisionist position, was apprehensive whether the fight against revisionism would take the party on to the sectarian path. Thorough discussions with comrades convinced him that in the interests of the Indian communist movement the split had become inevitable and he decided to take up the fight against the class collaborationist line. After that he played an important role in building and developing the CPI(M) in the country. History has confirmed the line pursued by the CPI(M) to be by and large correct. Today it is the biggest force amongst the Left in the country. EMS was the General Secretary of the Party from 1977 to an important phase in the 34 year old history of the Party.

He was an excellent campaigner and agitator. In 1965, during the Indo-Pakistan war, when most of us were in jail, and the Party advanced the slogan of peaceful solution of the problem, it was EMS who conducted the campaign throughout the country.

When the agitation against the Mandal Commission recommendations was going on, he wrote a booklet on the need for reservations. It dealt in depth about the need for reservations in a caste-ridden society. At the same time he opposed the concept of providing reservations to the "creamy layer" among the backward castes. There was no subject which he did not deal with, whether it be Marxist philosophy, political economy, Indian philosophy, literature or culture.

He never underestimated the importance of culture in developing the democratic movement in the country. He was always emphasising on the study of concrete conditions prevailing in each state and formulating policies and slogans on that basis. As General Secretary of the Party he used to pay special emphasis on developing the mass and class organisations and stressed on their democratic functioning and independent role by making them more broad based.

Throughout his life, particularly after he joined the Communist Party, EMS wrote innumerable articles and books on a variety of subjects. Notable among his works are Kerala Society and Politics, The Mahatma and The Ism, History of the Indian Freedom Struggle, Indian Planning in Crisis and Nehru, Ideology and Practice. His selected writings printed in English in two volumes covers the whole gamut of his ideas in the sphere of culture, philosophy, economy and politics. He also wrote an outline history of the Communist Party in Malayalam.

Even during his last days, despite his failing health, he used to contribute regularly to the party dailies, weeklies, theoretical organs and ofcourse to the Polit Bureau and the Central Committee. It was an exceptional capacity that very few possess. His work was ceaseless and he kept a strict schedule.

His simple style of living was a source of inspiration for everyone. His whole life was a life of selfless sacrifice in the cause of the Party and the working class. He gave the entire money from the sale of his ancestral property to the Party. When he was arrested in 1963, his wife had no house to go to. Their residence used to be in the Party headquarters in those days. His life was a model to be emulated by other revolutionaries. All those committed to the cause of the working people, who wish to advance the socialist ideas, will learn and draw sustenance from his life and work. Hopefully, this issue of The Marxist will contribute to that effort.

Bibliography

Anthony, J. Parel : *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule*, New Delhi, Vistaar, 2002.

Arabinda Poddar : *Tagore : The Political Personality*, Kolkata, Indiana, 2004.

Arun, Pseud.: *Testament of Subhas Bose*, Delhi, Rajkamal Pub., 1946.

Ashton, S.R.: *British Policy Towards the Indian States, 1905-1939*, London, Curzon, 1982.

Azad, Maulana Abul Kalam: *India Wins Freedom*, New Delhi, Orient Longman, 1959.

Bearce, George D.: *British Attitudes Towards India 1784-1858*, Oxford, University Press, 1961.

Bhattarcharjea, Ajit: *Countdown to Partition: The Final Days*, New Delhi, HarperCollins, 1998.

Bose, S. C., *The Indian Struggle, 1920-1942*, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1964.

Calvocoressi, Peter, and Guy Wint: *The Total War: the Story of World War II*, New York, Pantheon Books, 1972.

Charles Howard McIlwain: *Constitutionalism: Ancient and Modern*, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 1958.

Chatterji, Joya: *Bengal Divided: Hindu Communalism and Partition, 1932-1947*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 1994.

Chaudhuri, N.C.: *Thy Hand, Great Anarch!: India 1921-1952*, London, Chatto & Windus, 1987.

Derrett, J. : *Religion, Law, and the State in India*, London, Faber, 1968.

Dixit, Prabla: *Communalism: A Struggle for Power*, New Delhi, Orient Longman, 1981.

Foreman-Peck J. and Millward, R: *Public and Private Ownership of British Industry 1820-1990*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1994.

Gandhi, P. Jegadish : *Dr. Abdul Kalam's Futuristic India*, Deep and Deep, New Delhi, 2006.

Ghose, S.K.: *Politics of Violence: Dawn of a Dangerous Era*, Springfield, Nataraj, 1992.

Habberton, William: *Anglo-Russian Relations Concerning Afghanistan 1837-1907*, Urbana, University of Illinois, 1937.

Hasrat, Bikrama Jit: *Anglo-Sikh Relations, 1799-1849; A Reappraisal of the Rise and Fall of the Sikhs*, Hoshiazpur, Local Stockists vv Research Institute Book Agency, 1968.

Hurewitz, Jacob C.: *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East: A Documentary Record 1535-1914*, Princeton, New Jersey, 1956.

Huttenback. Robert A.: *British Relations with Sind 1799-1843; An Anatomy of Imperialism*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California, 1962.

Kelly, John B.: *Britain and the Persian Gulf 1795-1880*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968.

Nair, A. M.: *An Indian Freedom Fighter in Japan*, Bombay, Orient Longman, 1983.

Nair, Janaki: *Women and Law in Colonial India*, New Delhi, Kali, 1996.

Noorani, A.G. : *Indian Political Trials : 1775-1947*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Norris, James A.: *The First Afghan War 1838-1842*, Cambridge, University Press, 1967.

Ray, B.N. : *Gandhigiri : Satyagraha After Hundred Years*, New Delhi, Kaveri Books, 2008.

Rosen, P.: *Societies and Military Power: India and its Armies*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1996.

Singhal, D. P.: *India and Afghanistan: 1876-1907. A Study in Diplomatic Relations*, St. Lucia, University of Queensland, 1963.

Sivaram, M.: *The Road to Delhi*, Rutland, Vt., C.E. Tuttle Co., 1967.

INDEX

□□□